MARRIAGE
MARTIN J. SCOTT S.J.

MARRIAGE

By
MARTIN J. SCOTT, S.J.

NEW YORK
THE PAULIST PRESS
401 WEST 59TH STREET
1930

3122

Imprimi Potest:

EDWARD C. PHILLIPS, S.J.,
Provincial Maryland-New York.

Nihil Obstat:

ARTHUR J. SCANLAN, S.T.D.,
Censor Librorum.

Imprimatur:

✠PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES,
Archbishop of New York.

November 13, 1930.

Copyright, 1930, by "The Missionary Society of St. Paul the Apostle in the State of New York."

Printed in the U. S. A.

CONTENTS

PAGE

MARRIAGE RITE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH v

REPORT OF THE PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S COMMISSION vii

STATEMENT OF REVEREND J. M. LLOYD THOMAS ix

STATEMENT OF RT. REV. WILLIAM T. MANNING, D.D. xi

CHAPTER I

SEX 1

CHAPTER II

MODERN MORALITY 19

CHAPTER III

MARRIAGE 38

CHAPTER IV

CHRIST TRUE GOD 54

CHAPTER V

CHRIST'S CHURCH TRUE AS GOD 73

CONTENTS

PAGE

CHAPTER VI

THE TRUE NATURE OF MARRIAGE 90

CHAPTER VII

DIVORCE 108

CHAPTER VIII

ANNULMENT 135

CHAPTER IX

SEPARATION 153

CHAPTER X

BIRTH-CONTROL 169

Marriage Rite

Of the Catholic Church

BEFORE the marriage is performed it is announced publicly three times in the church, on three different days of worship.

At the end of each announcement it is solemnly proclaimed that anyone who knows a just cause or impediment why the two persons named should not be married is bound in conscience to make it known to the proper authorities. After every reasonable precaution has been taken to make sure that the bride and groom may be validly married, they appear before their parish priest, in whose presence and that of two witnesses the following ceremony takes place.

The priest addressing the groom says:

"Wilt thou, John, take Mary here present for thy lawful wife according to the rite of our holy Mother the Church?"

The groom answers: "I will."

The priest then addresses the bride:

"Wilt thou, Mary, take John here present for thy lawful husband according to the rite of our holy Mother the Church?"

The bride answers: "I will."

Bride and groom then join hands and the groom says: "I, John, take thee, Mary, for my

lawful wife, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part."

The bride in turn says: "I, Mary, take thee, John, for my lawful husband, to have and to hold from this day forward, for better, for worse, for richer, for poorer, in sickness and in health, till death do us part."

The priest then says:

"I unite you in matrimony in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

While pronouncing these words he blesses the bride and groom. Then follows the blessing of the ring by the priest as he sprinkles it with holy water. It is then presented to the groom, who places it on the bride's finger, as he says:

"With this ring I thee wed, and I plight unto thee my troth."

Both kneel while the priest prays over them as follows:

"We beseech Thee, O Lord, to bless this couple and the holy rite by which Thou dost perpetuate the human race, that as they have been joined in wedlock by Thee, they may be faithful to Thy precepts, through Christ our Lord. Amen."

From the report of the PRESBYTERIAN GENERAL ASSEMBLY'S COMMISSION ON MARRIAGE, DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE:

"There is a unanimous agreement both inside and outside of the Church on one point. Christianity has failed to reproduce in the present generation the Christian marriage ideal"; and, "the result of this neglect on the part of the Church in inculcating in the present generation the divine principles that sanctify marriage and educate it in regard to the spiritual qualities necessary for a successful Christian home is obvious. It has culminated in a sex stampede and a practical acceptance of a pagan standard of life and living on a hitherto unprecedented scale"; and, "the time has come for the Church to become vocal on the subject of marriage."

Statement of the Protestant Clergyman, Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, *in the "Hibbert Journal":*

The Catholic Church, "whatever its past or present laxities of practice, is seen to be the one uncompromising corporate witness to that moral code of Christianity which preserves Western civilization from final collapse. It presents the last loyalty of the human race to its own highest moral standards. It is the iron bulwark of Christianity against the overwhelming invasion of the corrupting neo-paganism of our times. Anglican and Free Church leaders may also be found who are rock-firm for the Christian ethic, but they can commit no one except themselves. There is no authoritative moral theology which can tell us what is the final judgment of Anglicans and Free Churchmen on questions such as marriage, divorce, birth control, companionate marriage, euthanasia, suicide. Only Rome speaks with one voice on such themes, and these are the issues of life and death, of the survival or decline of the West. On these themes no one, least of all our belauded 'frank' and 'honest,' oversexed and promiscuously-minded modern youth can keep an open mind for a single hour without risk of ruin. This is the supreme attraction of Rome—its moral challenge to a high temperance, chastity and self-control."

From the Sermon of the Protestant Episcopalian Bishop of New York, Rt. Rev. William T. Manning, D.D., *on the occasion of the consecration of the Rev. Dr. Charles K. Gilbert:*

"And so in this Church we hold fast to our Catholic heritage, to the Divinely instituted Church, and Ministry and Sacraments, not because they are historical, or venerable, or orderly, but because they are from Christ Himself, and if we use them faithfully they bring us to Christ and keep us near to Him.

"We are living in disturbed and confused times. Men are defying all the laws of earth and heaven, casting aside all the hard won experience of our race, denying those things upon which the dignity and worth of life depend, tearing away the sanctities, and the very decencies of human life. We are seeing now that there is no other foundation for society, for morals, for conduct, but faith in God and reverence for Him and for His Law. The greatest and deepest need of human life today is a new vision of the supernatural, an awakening to the presence and the power of the Living God."

MARRIAGE

CHAPTER I

Sex

SEX attraction is one of the most powerful forces in human nature. Nature does nothing in vain. Sex attraction is so strong because on it depends the perpetuation of the human race.

A young man and woman would not leave the comfort and security of home to venture together on a new career in life unless strongly impelled to it by sexual attraction of mind, heart and person.

Love is the result of sexual attraction between persons of the opposite sex, who find in each other qualities of mind and heart which urge them to life-long and intimate companionship.

Lust, although it may accompany love, is not love. One may be affected by sexual passion for a person and yet despise or hate that person. Sex passion, like any other passion, is violent while it lasts, but like all things violent, does not

last long. The passion of anger, for instance, no matter how violent, subsides after a furious outburst.

A sharp distinction should be made between love and lust, as otherwise disillusionment is sure to follow in most cases where young people are drawn together with a view to matrimony.

The mistake frequently made by young people now-a-days is that marriage is perpetual honeymoon. When experience disillusions these persons, they are apt to think that marriage has failed them, whereas in reality they have misconceived marriage.

Passion is violent and passing. Love is calm and enduring.

Nature employs sex attraction of mind and heart to draw man and woman into intimate relationship. The nature of this intimate relationship is such that it requires permanence. Marriage is the permanent state wherein those who have been duly united, live together as man and wife, and discharge the duties of parenthood, which ordinarily follows the relationship of husband and wife.

The attraction which draws together man and woman for marriage is ordinarily that of love, based on mutual esteem. Passion is only one phase of love, not love itself. The passion of

love subsides gradually, but love, if it really be love, continues and grows stronger with time. The highest degree of love is often found between couples who have been united for forty, fifty or sixty years. When passion has long been dead, love is often strongest.

Nature employs the passion of love to induce man and woman to take the step which makes them man and wife. The sex appeal of mind and heart urges man and woman to intimate companionship, which may be shared lawfully in wedlock only. Hence the institution of marriage. Satisfaction of the sex urge outside the state of marriage is unlawful. Not only God, but nature itself forbids sex intercourse outside wedlock.

The ordinary consequence of habitual sex intercourse is child-birth unless contraceptives be used. The use of contraceptives is a perversion of nature, consequently forbidden by nature. By contraceptives nature's functions are frustrated. The frustration of nature is a crime against nature, as will be shown when we come to the consideration of the subject of birth-control.

Habitual sex intercourse, therefore, under natural conditions, ordinarily results in child-birth.

Outside the marriage state, a child cannot ordinarily be properly cared for. First of all the

child has no legal father. Moreover, the child has no certainty who his father is. This is a dreadful handicap to a person through life. Besides, the unmarried mother of a child has no one to care for her properly. The condition of a mother is altogether different from that of a single woman. She needs a home for herself and child, and support besides.

It is evident, therefore, that sexual intercourse by its very nature requires the state of matrimony, unless a crime against nature be committed. For this reason, sexual indulgence outside wedlock is a sin. The very same act, which in marriage has been ordained and blessed by God, is forbidden and punished outside marriage.

God's commands are not arbitrary. If God forbids something, it is not to tyrannize over man, but to benefit him. A hand-rail placed alongside a narrow footbridge over a deep chasm is not to hinder the traveler, but to save him from possible ruin. It is so with God's commandments with regard to mankind. Nature is really the expression of the Creator's Power and Intelligence. God's Commandments and nature's laws go hand in hand. Not one of the commandments may be broken without detriment to man. The observance of the Commandments operates for man's welfare.

Let us see by a little consideration how it is that God's Commandments are for man's well-being. One of the Commandments is "Thou shalt not kill." Suppose God allowed murder, what a dreadful condition would prevail among mankind!

Another Commandment is "Thou shalt not steal." If God allowed another to take away our possessions, where would society be?

Again God commands "Thou shalt not commit adultery." What would we think of God if He allowed a man's wife or daughter to be at the mercy of a lustful intruder?

And so of all the Commandments. Not one of them could be dropped from the Decalogue without detriment to mankind. Before they were proclaimed on Mt. Sinai they were written on the heart of man.

Thou shalt not lie, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt honor thy father and mother, thou shalt not commit adultery, these and the rest are nature's laws as well as God's.

It is necessary to understand this in connection with the subject we are considering.

Some people have the idea that the Church established by Christ has invented a code of morality of its own. Nothing could be farther from fact. The Church of Christ simply pro-

claims the doctrine which nature and God have ordained. The Church of Christ insists on the Ten Commandments proclaimed by the Creator. The six special Commandments of the Church are only aids to the observance of the Ten Commandments.

It is evident, therefore, that God, the Church and nature are really one and the same authority.

The passion of love like every other passion will lead to disaster unless controlled. Nature and God dictate that this passion should lead to lawful wedlock. For this reason, nature as well as God forbids sexual promiscuity. Sexual promiscuity cannot ordinarily be practised without either frustrating nature or else bringing into the world a fatherless child. It is clear from this that all forms of sexual satisfaction outside marriage are condemned not only by religion but also by nature.

The nature of sex is such that sexual familiarity is apt to be perilous, especially to youth. This is why society throws about young people so many limitations with regard to social meetings of the sexes. It is true that at present the office of chaperon has to a great extent fallen into disuse, but it is also true that the morals of the young are suffering dreadfully in consequence.

SEX

Our forefathers were not all old fogies. The customs practised in Christendom for centuries had a basis in human nature. The nature of the sex passion may be likened to a train of powder. You may keep the match from the powder, but if the powder be ignited at all, there is no stopping it.

It is so with sex relationship. Sexual familiarity almost inevitably leads to extremes. For this reason, unrestricted association of young people of opposite sex, has always been prohibited both by Church and society. Human nature is so constituted that in this matter it is not enough to consider the good intentions of the parties, but human weakness as well. The sex urge is one of the most dominant of human instincts. It was made so by the Creator in order to secure the perpetuity of mankind. Consequently, unless safeguards be thrown about it, it will lead to excess and harm.

The sex passion is like a mettlesome horse, very spirited and admirable under control, but wild and dangerous unless held in check.

It is because moderation in sex matters is so difficult that so many formalities are associated with the mingling of the sexes. Of late, many of these formalities have been done away with, to the dreadful impairment of juvenile morals.

It is because the sex urge is so strong, and that its exercise outside wedlock is unlawful that young people marry. The satisfaction of the sex instinct in marriage carries out the purpose of the Author of nature. Outside wedlock, the gratification of this instinct interferes with nature's designs. The world is strewn with human wreckage as a consequence of unlawful sex relationship.

There are those who affirm that there is no harm in sex intercourse between unmarried persons provided the woman is willing. No woman, by consenting to what is unlawful, can make it lawful. Moreover, the woman who thus consents must either use contraceptives or take the chance of becoming an unmarried mother. If she use contraceptives, she is perverting and frustrating one of nature's vital functions, and becomes thereby guilty of serious sin. If she does not use contraceptives, she leaves herself liable to motherhood, which in her case means disgrace or abortion.

We see, therefore, that nature confirms what the Catholic faith inculcates with regard to sex transgressions.

A short time ago, I was on my way from New York to Washington. On the train were a number of distinguished lawyers who were to hold

a conference with a senatorial committee at the Capital. After a while, one of these lawyers addressed me, and asked if I minded having a chat with him. I replied that I should be glad to do so.

He began by saying that he always liked to talk to a Catholic priest, although not a Catholic himself. I returned the compliment by saying I always liked to talk with a Protestant minister although not one myself.

I can best give the gist of the conversation that followed by putting it into the form which it actually took. This lawyer, I afterwards learned, was formerly a judge, and his friends addressed him by that title, so I shall call him judge, and myself priest, in the following dialogue.

"I'm a great admirer of your Church, Father, it's the greatest organization in the world. If you'd only let down the barriers a little, I think everybody would join you."

"Just what barriers do you refer to, Judge?"

"O, you know. Your Church is altogether too strict on—well, a lot of things."

"For instance, Judge?"

"Well, for one thing, your Church is too impossible with regard to sex matters."

"In what particular?"

"You're too narrow on divorce, for one thing. Your Church binds a married man for life."

"No, not our Church. Our Church did not make marriage indissoluble."

"Do you mean to say that your Church allows divorce?"

"No. I said our Church did not make marriage indissoluble."

"Who did, then?"

"The Divine Founder of Christianity."

"Well, then, why don't all the Christian Churches regard marriage indissoluble?"

"The only Church which was established by Christ, and which goes back directly to Him, and has never modified His teaching, proclaims as He did, that marriage is indissoluble. What the other Churches, which separated from His Church teach, does not matter."

"Then you claim a monopoly on Christ's teaching?"

"Christ said of His Church: 'As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you.' Christ's Church is His representative in the world. For which reason St. Paul termed her prelates the Ambassadors of Christ. An ambassador speaks in the name of his government; the Catholic Church speaks in the name of Christ, who said of her, 'He that heareth you, heareth Me.' "

"All that you say, Father, takes it for granted that yours is the only Church founded by Christ?"

"Can you name any other Church, Judge, which goes directly back to Christ and was founded by Him?"

"Don't all the Christian Churches?"

"No. I can name the date, place and human founder of every other Christian denomination in the world, and not one of them goes back to Christ nor has Him as Founder."

"Well, we're getting off the track. I said that your Church ought to lower the bars on sex matters."

"And I said that the Church did not raise the bars. She simply keeps them where Christ placed them. The indissolubility of marriage is not the legislation of the Church, but the mandate of nature and of nature's God."

"I know that's what you hand out. Excuse me, Father, I don't mean to offend. It strikes me, however, that your Church takes for granted that she alone is in the right."

"She has Christ's divine guarantee for her belief."

"Well, let's get down to the matter we began with. We'll pass over divorce, since you are not open to conviction on that. But what about your

impossible position with regard to minor sex liberties?"

"For instance?"

"O, well, if a fellow wants to go with a girl, and wants to go the limit, and she's willing, you people make it an awful sin."

"No, WE don't."

"Don't you make it to be what you call a mortal sin?"

"No, WE don't make it a sin, but God Almighty has made it a sin.

"How do you make that out?"

"Do you believe in Holy Scripture?"

"Well, I suppose so. I'll say, yes."

"I presume, then, Judge, that you would consider it a mortal sin, if it was serious enough to keep one out of heaven, wouldn't you?"

"Yes, but what has that to do with it?"

"Everything. Scripture says: 'neither fornicators nor idolaters nor adulterers shall possess the Kingdom of heaven' (1 Cor. vi. 9). That is plain and direct, isn't it?"

"If you take it your way yes, but all do not so interpret it."

"That is neither here nor there. Until divisions sprang up among Christians, and certain sects separated from the Church of Christ, all Christendom believed that such sex offenses

were mortal sins. Protestantism, with its doctrine of private judgment, opened the door to every kind of belief or no belief at all. But Christ appointed His Church to be the infallible interpreter of His doctrine, and as such her judgment is not that of fallible man but of God."

"That's a big claim for your Church."

"He who said 'As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you,' endowed His Church with the power of transmitting His doctrine to mankind infallibly and perpetually. After all, you as a Judge should realize that if the Founders of our Republic instituted the Supreme Court of the United States as virtually an infallible interpreter of the Constitution, the Founder of Christianity could make the Church He Himself established the infallible interpreter of His doctrine."

At this point the conversation stopped for awhile. The Judge had nothing to reply to the last statement. For a few minutes he sat silent in deep reflection. I re-opened the conversation by asking a question, which apparently had nothing to do with the subject we had been discussing. My purpose was to get his opinion on a matter without his realizing what I was after. I knew if I asked him directly, he would fall back

on his old line of thinking, and that he would consent to nothing that agreed with Catholic teaching on sex matters. So the dialogue continued.

"Are you married, Judge?"

"Yes, I have two sons and a daughter."

"How old is your daughter?"

"Nineteen. Why do you ask?"

"O, I don't know. I was just thinking something, but I guess it better not be said."

"Out with it, Father, I won't mind anything you say."

"Well, Judge, I gather from what you said before we talked on sex matters, that you are to advise one of the Cabinet members on a diplomatic affair. Suppose now, that your wife and daughter were with you . . . "

"They are with me, Father. They are in the car ahead with some friends."

"Well, suppose that while you are in Washington on this matter, one of the clever foreign diplomats, a married man, should insinuate himself into the affections of your daughter and persuade her to yield willingly to his lustful proposals, what would you do?"

Before I had come to the end of the sentence, the Judge's face reddened, his eyes flashed, and with an oath he exclaimed that he would

shoot the scoundrel. Let the dialogue tell the rest.

"Go slow now, Judge, go slow. Didn't you say you saw no wrong in it if the woman was willing?"

"Yes, but my daughter is but a child, and those clever fellows have a way of insinuating themselves into the graces of an innocent girl."

"Yes, Judge, but is not every girl innocent until some one misleads her? The lowest street-walker was once an innocent girl. If men respected the virtue of women, there would be no such persons as those unfortunates whom society despises after having debased them."

"My God, I never looked at it that way before. What you said about my daughter brought the matter before me in a new light."

"The true light, isn't it so, Judge?"

"My God, but you're right!"

"The Catholic Church is always right, Judge, if you understand her. The trouble with those who differ from her, and condemn her, is that either they do not understand her, or else do not understand the matter they are talking about."

Here the subject ended, as one of the Judge's friends joined us, and the conversation turned on other matters.

The Catholic Church has the guarantee of her Divine Founder, not to err in religious teaching. Besides this divine guarantee, the Church has been in existence twenty centuries and understands human nature better than any other body on earth. Twenty centuries of human experience ought to make the Church a safe guide even if she had not help from above.

It is a matter of history that whenever the teaching of the Catholic Church on morals has been ignored, society has suffered. Like her Divine Founder, she is the light of the world, securely directing mankind to the port of eternal welfare.

The Catholic Church teaches and has always taught that sex promiscuity is a mortal sin. The Catholic Church teaches and always has taught, that familiarity between the sexes which incites to lust is sinful.

In proportion as the Catholic teaching on sex prevails will society and the individual be better and happier.

Sex conduct was never so deplorable as at present. And never before were there so many sex tragedies. Society is honeycombed with sex transgressions. Our young people are saturated with sex talk, sex literature, sex plays, sex diseases. Sex has become an obsession with very

many. Under the guise of instructing and safeguarding the young, they are filled with sex filth. Scripture warns that the subject should not so much as be mentioned in ordinary conversation.

It is a mistake to believe that knowing all about sex matters is going to guard people from sex sins. It is the very opposite. Some of the worst sex offenders are those who know all the loathsome consequences of sex promiscuity. For hundreds of years Christianity gave the world chaste youths and maidens without sex instruction. It is enough for people to know that impurity is a sin which destroys the soul.

The Church, knowing that modesty is the guardian of purity, inculcates modesty in her children. Those who are modest will not be impure. Modesty of speech and dress will do more to preserve youth chaste than all the sex instruction ever devised. Sex is an instinct. It dictates reserve and modesty. Our ancestors had little sex instruction, yet were admirable fathers and mothers, faithful husbands and wives.

The Catholic Church acts with regard to sex in the same way as nature. Both nature and Church safeguard purity by modesty. Normal human nature is modest. It is only when society degenerates that modesty takes flight and in-

decency brazenly stalks abroad. Indecency is abroad now.

It behooves all those who have the true welfare of society at heart, to endeavor by word and deed, and especially by example, to uphold the Christian Standard of sex morality.

CHAPTER II

Modern Morality

IT must be evident to the most casual observer that a notable decline in morals has taken place in our generation.

There is much in public and private life which can be characterized by no other term than shocking. Dishonesty, violence and sexual laxity are flagrant and widespread. Respect for parents has become almost a lost virtue.

Juvenile independence or insolence has asserted itself to the point where youth is virtually a law to itself. Never before in Christendom has vice been so open, so general and so much condoned. That the picture here presented is not overdrawn is evident from the following extract from the New York *Times*, June 2, 1930.

> "'If America is really going forward it must go back, back to some things old and fine, familiar and fundamental,' declared the Rev Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick in his sermon yesterday before the Riverside Congregation worshiping in Temple Beth-El, Fifth Avenue and Seventy-sixth Street.

" 'These are "old wells to dig again," Dr. Fosdick said.

" 'One thinks of this as he sees the filth that like an open sewer flows through our theatres and magazines until one of the leading citizens of this community has said rightly that our children will look back on our time and call it "the dirty decade," said Dr. Fosdick. 'Nothing that you call progress will get us out of that, only the re-emergence in us of something old: self-respect, decency, disgust at things contemptible and low, public revulsion against panderers who grow financially fat on the exploitation of vice.' "

There must be a reason for this moral debacle, and for the complaisance with which it is regarded by the public generally. What is the reason for this debasement of moral standards and conduct?

Some attribute it to the aftermath of the World War. But the alarm was sounded before the War. The War may have accelerated but did not cause the dreadful condition which now confronts society.

Let us first consider the matter of dishonesty. Even before the War dishonesty was a national sin with us. It was almost taken for granted that people were not to be trusted. In business,

detectives were employed to watch the clerks as well as the patrons. On transportation lines every conceivable check was put upon those who in any way had to do with money. Even in the schools the teachers were subjected to a humiliating system of supervision.

It was all but taken for granted that the only law of conduct consisted in not being found out. Distrust of others was almost universal.

Let me relate an occurrence which came under my own experience. I had some business with the proprietor and chief executive of one of the largest department stores in America. From conversation with him I learned that he had some seven thousand employees in his establishment. I made the remark that it must be a very great burden to manage such an extensive business. He replied that the business itself gave him little concern, as it was very well systematized, but that what did give him much concern was the matter of dishonesty. He then informed me that he employed thirty detectives to watch his employees. When I expressed surprise at this, he added that he had seven detectives to watch the thirty. Before I was over my astonishment, he concluded by saying that he had to keep his eye on the seven! Five years after this conversation, this proprietor himself was arrested for

embezzlement, found guilty, and sentenced to State Prison for a term of years.

Underhand methods, misrepresentation of goods, deception of all kinds permeate the mercantile world.

Life insurance, fire insurance, accident insurance have been perverted by many of those insured into money-making schemes, thus defrauding the companies, which means the public eventually, since it is the public which finally bears the burden of increased rates.

Instead of the former principle of holding a man to be honest until he was proved dishonest, the modern rule is to regard him as suspect until he can demonstrate his integrity. No one can now fill a responsible position without being bonded, and the bonding companies themselves have a special department for keeping those insured under surveillance.

And so it is all along the line. This is so evident that it is a commonplace to affirm it. But it is done in order to make more evident the thesis which is the subject of this consideration. So much for dishonesty.

Let us pass now to the matter of violence. It is safe to say that life in the jungle is more secure than it is now in many of our large cities.

What a humiliating spectacle it is in this age

of culture and liberty and law to see armored cars traversing the streets of our cities. Gangsters lie in wait at every turn to rob and kill. Scarcely a day passes but robbery and murder are recorded. For a few dollars a thug will shoot a defenseless merchant. Even in the neighborhood of one's own home a man peaceably passing along the street is apt to be struck down and robbed by a foot-pad. Bullies hire themselves out to beat or kill for a price.

There have always been deeds of violence, but they were exceptional. Now they are the rule. The surprise is not their occurrence but their non-occurrence. Life is about the cheapest commodity in the estimation of the criminals of the present day.

Violence, and violation of law generally, have become so notable that crime commissions have been established in order to assemble data to deal with the evil. There is widespread disregard for all law and disrespect for all authority. Gangster chiefs defy city and state governments. Very often the sworn guardians of law and order are in collusion with the very crooks and murderers whom they are pledged to ferret out and bring to condign punishment.

As was said of dishonesty, so what is here recorded of violence is commonplace, but is stated

in order to present in a general way data for the subject under consideration.

We shall now pass to another characteristic of modern morality, namely, sexual laxity.

The family is the basis of society. Without the family there would be no state. Whenever in any period of history family life has degenerated, the people of that period and race have degenerated or disappeared.

Last year (1929) one out of every six marriages in the United States ended in divorce.

There is now more stability in a business contract than in the marriage bond. A real estate transaction has more security than matrimony.

Last year (1929) there were 130,000 children whose parents were divorced in the United States during the year.

When we reflect that most divorces are followed by a new marriage, we may understand in some slight degree, what it means for these children to be the offspring of divorced parents. Formerly, marriage was the most sacred and permanent contract in life. Now, it is entered upon, often, with less deliberation and sense of responsibility than in buying an automobile.

When the first flame of passion subsides, as it inevitably must, a new face may easily cause incompatibility in either husband or wife. Instead

of patching up differences as formerly, recourse is had to divorce, and ordinarily a new marriage, if such an alliance may be called marriage.

Husband or wife, desirous of breaking the marriage tie, in order to form another, will play fast and loose with marriage fidelity. The result is broken homes, and broken hearts, and callous children, if there be children in the case. With the loose example of parents before them, children of divorced parents are not apt to have higher standards than their elders.

Moreover, young people realizing that marriage does not give them permanent security of each other's affections or support, are cautious about having children, lest they be a barrier to a future alliance or a burden in case a future marriage fails them. The fate of the offspring is deplorable when father and mother part in misunderstanding or hatred, and it is necessary for the little ones to take sides with either one or the other.

The tragedies among children of divorced parents are the most poignant feature of this dreadful divorce plague. The family being the basis of society, whenever family morality declines, the morality of society itself declines.

There is no need to prove that society morality is at the lowest ebb. Promiscuity among young

people in many circles is taken for granted. It is not uncommon for maidens of reputed respectability not to blush at an immodest proposal, which formerly would lead to dire consequences for the man rash enough to make it. Many maidens not only do not resent such proposals, but easily comply with them, knowing that by artificial means they can avoid the natural outcome of such association.

Recently one of our national magazines stated that among certain fashionable people, men no longer thought that the women they were to marry were chaste. It added the alarming statement that even after marriage neither husband nor wife expected each other to be faithful. Even if this statement be an exaggeration, the very fact that it was proclaimed without challenge is a dreadful arraignment of modern society.

Alarming, however, as is the statement, it seems to be borne out, in great measure, by that mirror of society, the stage. Marriage infidelity seems to be a staple offering both of the spoken and silent drama. Moreover, the popular magazines are crowded with articles on sex promiscuity and marriage infidelity. The naked displays on the stage and on picture magazines seem to be another confirmation of the shocking charges made against present-day social conduct.

MODERN MORALITY

It seems that the most common and profitable offering of the modern theater is an appeal to sex. It is only necessary to glance at the billboard advertisements in front of the motion picture houses in order to realize that chastity has parted company with many of the producers and exploiters of the cinema industry.

Another indication that immodesty is rampant is the character of the dances in vogue even among the more or less exclusive sets of society. Human nature being what it is, it is hard to understand how some of these dances can be tolerated by fathers and mothers who are concerned for the chastity of their children. The fact that these scandalous and vulgar exhibitions occur under the very eyes of parents is an awful arraignment of present-day morality and moral standards.

Some of these dances might be expected in the jungle, but hardly among those who have pretentions to decency. It only goes to show that modern morality needs drastic reform. And how is it to be effected?

Before we consider the remedy, let us try to find the cause. When a patient is ill, the physician before prescribing endeavors to find the cause of the malady. A right diagnosis is more than half the cure.

What has caused the deplorable state of affairs regarding dishonesty, violence and impurity? What is the disease of which these shameful conditions are the symptoms? In a word, it is paganism. Not the paganism which worships idols, but the paganism which worships self, makes self to be the end and object of existence. It is the old paganism which proclaims:

"Let us eat, drink and be merry, for tomorrow we die." It is the paganism which is summed up in the phrase: "The flower that once has bloomed forever dies." It is the paganism which makes man a law unto himself, the paganism which denies that man has a soul, the paganism which affirms that man is matter only, that he is but a high grade animal, that his actions are the result not of free will or conscience, but of material forces which he cannot control.

This paganism which has the exterior of Christian culture, but the heart of heathenism, affirms that the body is supreme, that it is a deity at whose shrine man must bow down in absolute submission.

It is the old materialism, as old as man, revived again, and again plunging him into animalism and despair.

It is the materialism of the pagan Roman Empire which confronted Christianity at its very

birth, and for three centuries sought to destroy Christ and His Church.

It is the paganism of material evolution, which teaches man that he is only a noble beast, and bids him follow his impulses instead of controlling them by reason.

Animals are guided by impulse because they have instinct to guide them, which man has not. Man has instead reason to direct him, and if he fail to submit his bodily lusts to the control of reason, he will fall lower than the beasts of the field. The world is strewn with human wrecks who have followed desire rather than reason.

Tortured bodies, broken lives, lost reason, and family tragedies are the monuments to man's lust. If reason do not rule, man will be the slave of his body rather than its master.

The most lamentable spectacle among mankind is the victim of uncontrolled passion. Those who affirm that man's inclinations are given to him as nature's guide have but to look at the victims of any vice in order to see the fallacy of this contention.

The drunkard follows his passion for drink, and it makes a physical and mental wreck of him. The degenerate follows his passion for carnal gratification, and it leads him to imbecility.

No, man is more than animal, even though his

body be animal. Man lacks the instinct of animals for guidance, but has instead reason to direct him, but if he let body rather than mind control his conduct, he must not be surprised at the slavery which results.

There is no chain of slavery so galling as that forged by vice. Man pays a terribly high price for serving animal lusts instead of dominating them. Moreover, vice never gives what it promises. Instead of satisfying, it creates increased desire. It urges its victim on to indulgence after indulgence until it finally drives him to despair.

There was never so much uncontrolled passion in the world as there is today, and never was there so much disquiet, dissatisfaction and despair. Never were there so many suicides, so many insane, so many hopeless lives, as now under the reign of materialism.

And what does it all mean? It means that man is made for something higher than bodily pleasures. Man has a soul as well as a body, and unless the soul is in harmony with rational nature, all the bodily gratification in the world will not satisfy man.

And how is man's soul to be in harmony with reason? By rational control of the body rather than enslavement to it. Those who are in the

grip of any vice are its slaves. Vice puts a heavier burden on man than does rational control. It may cost man a good deal to be master of his body, but it costs him more to be its slave.

In the beginning, it is easier to yield to lust than to conquer it, but eventually it will exact a dreadful tax on its concessions. But, it may be asked, how is weak man to be strong against his bodily impulses? Even the great St. Paul experienced in himself the lust of the flesh against the spirit. Torn between the law of the spirit and that of the flesh, he exclaimed:

"I find then a law that when I have a will to dó good, evil is present with me. For I am delighted with the law of God, according to the inward man: But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind, and captivating me in the law of sin, that is in my members" (Rom. vii. 21-23).

If the Apostle Paul experienced the rebellion of the flesh against the spirit, we should not be surprised if we experience the same revolt.

Temptation does not make sin. The greatest saint is tempted as well as the vilest sinner. The difference between saint and sinner is not that one is free from temptation and the other is not, but that the saint conquers while the sinner surrenders.

Man is the only being of visible creation whose lower nature is in rebellion against his higher. Other living creatures have foes outside. Man's greatest foe is within himself. It is the consequence of original sin. Man, in the beginning, rebelled against his Maker, and now his body rebels against his spirit.

Chesterton has well said that if Christianity did not teach the doctrine of original sin, man would be obliged to invent some such doctrine to explain human nature. If man masters his passions, it is a struggle. If he does not master them, it becomes a harder struggle.

Paganism proclaims that man should be a law to himself. This is what makes it so attractive. Modern paganism has replaced the Ten Commandments by one of its own. Its law of life is gratification of every desire. Its concern is to avoid present evil consequences of indulgence. Its great commandment is to observe exterior decorum.

Good form is the shrine at which modern pagans worship. Good form takes the place of God. And as it is easy to preserve good form, even while violating the most serious precepts, they aim to live externally virtuous, although internally vicious.

External respectability is their standard of

conduct. With them there is no God, no hereafter, no conscience, no obligations!

Modern morality must nevertheless conform to Christian decency. Ancient pagans openly practised vice. Modern pagans pay Christianity the compliment of conforming externally to Christian standards. But the wages of sin is death. We see this verified on all sides of us. Those who give free rein to their passions, are not satisfied. It is like drinking salt water to quench thirst. Passion goads its victim on to mental and bodily ruin.

Society today is rotten. With more wealth and comforts than at any other period of history, society today is more wretched, more discontented, more destitute of peace than at any time in the history of mankind. What does it all mean?

It means that God's way is the best way. It means that the code of man cannot supplant the code of man's Maker. It means that the Ten Commandments are best for man's welfare both here and hereafter. It means that there can be no peace for man if he be not at peace with God.

There is peace in struggle, if one struggle for what is right. And there is unhappiness in indulgence if one indulges against reason.

When the Apostle Paul said, "I do not that

good which I will, but the evil which I hate, that I do" (Rom. vii. 15), he was voicing the combat that stirs the soul of every man who tries to live right.

But besides voicing the struggle of the good man to live right, he also proclaims: "I can do all things in Him Who strengtheneth me" (Phil. iv. 13).

Again he says: "In all these things we overcome because of Him that hath loved us" (Rom. viii. 37). And he specifies what it is that enables him to overcome: "The grace of God by Jesus Christ our Lord" (Rom. vii. 25).

No matter how weak man may be, he has the assurance of God that he will be strong to conquer every temptation if he turns to his Maker for help. "My Grace is sufficient for thee" (2 Cor. xii. 9).

Man's life on earth is warfare. It is war whether we control passion or surrender to passion. The battle to control passion ends in eternal victory. The battle to satisfy uncontrolled passion ends in eternal despair. The world was plunged in despair when Christ came and proclaimed that He was the Way, the Truth and the Life.

His religion brought hope into despairing humanity. It changed Pagan into Christian Rome.

It brought peace to those of good will. It enabled man to be master instead of the servant of his body.

Christianity today is confronted by the same paganism which challenged it at its birth. It conquered then, it will conquer now. The conquest then was not without cost, as witness the martyrs. Its victory now may have to be dearly earned, but it will triumph.

Meanwhile, modern paganism is destroying itself.

Dr. William Marshall Urban, Professor of Philosophy at Dartmouth, in an address May 28, 1930, to the faculty and students of the Protestant General Theological Seminary, N. Y., said: "There was never a time when man has been so knowing and at the same time so unknowing. I have come to the conclusion that we are trying to decide whether we are merely high-grade monkeys or sons of God. Is it any wonder that in view of the incoherence of Modernism there is the beginning of a reaction? It is for us to insist that religion without creed is meaningless, that the Christian religion is not only a life but the philosophy of life."

Thus speaks this non-Catholic teacher, confirming what the Catholic Church has taught from the beginning.

Christ's creed is the true law of life. The Author of nature knows what is best for human nature. Nature cannot be defied with impunity. She has her own way of collecting toll on transgressions, but she always collects.

Modern morality is the morality of self-indulgence, the morality which bids the murderer to kill, and the robber to steal, and the libertine to indulge his lust, and the powerful to oppress.

The man who affirms that it is right to follow impulse, who contends that he is controlled by bodily forces, has no right to object to the murderer who shoots him down, or the thief who steals his money. If the libertine is controlled by material forces, so are the murderer and the thief. If the voluptuary is justified in yielding to lust, so is the murderer in yielding to the impulse to kill.

Modern morality is attractive to those who want to be a law to themselves, but it is the attraction which destroys body and soul. Christ is God. Any morality that differs from His is the code of death, not of life.

What the Son of God proclaimed is true now as then: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the Commandments" (Matt. xix. 17).

Christ, the Light of the World, illumines the path to everlasting life and happiness.

Blessed are we if we guide our steps by this light.

CHAPTER III

Marriage

EVERYBODY is interested in marriage. This is natural, as marriage is the ordinary state of mankind.

A satisfactory marriage is one of the greatest blessings of life. On the other hand, an unfortunate marriage is one of the saddest afflictions that can befall man or woman.

The main purpose of courtship, or keeping company before marriage, should be to ascertain if man and woman will be companionable in the intimate association which the marriage state implies. The marriage state is the closest personal union on earth. It is so close and so consequential that Holy Scripture declares that it takes precedence over every other relationship in life. Normal marriage means not only lifelong companionship of man and woman, but also the responsibility of parenthood. Husband and wife are destined, ordinarily, to be father and mother. Marriage thus becomes the origin of the family, which in turn is the basis of society.

It will be seen, therefore, that marriage is the

concern not only of the individual, but also of the public. Marriage has always been one of the most vital matters which have engaged the attention of state and church. Every government known to mankind has legislated directly or indirectly regarding matrimony.

Furthermore, in proportion as marriage has been duly respected both society and the individual have been better in every way. Mankind, consequently, may very well be interested in marriage.

Sex instinct is one of the most dominant impulses of human nature. The Creator made it so powerful in order to ensure the perpetuation of the human race. Were sex impulse less strong, it would not, ordinarily, impel men and women to leave the security of home and the endearments of family in order to form a new relationship. Man and woman are attracted to each other, in God's designs, that they may establish a household of their own, become factors in the perpetuation of society, and mutually comfort and sustain each other.

In life's warfare woman needs a protector. Man in the struggle for existence requires the sympathy and affection which woman is by nature so wonderfully endowed to bestow. By the arrangement of a wise Providence, man supplies

what woman most needs, love, support, protection. By the same wise Providence, woman gives to man the tender devotion, the solicitous and loyal companionship which enables him to face courageously the vicissitudes of life.

It is thus seen that man and woman by nature supplement each other.

The ideal marriage is that wherein the qualities, character and virtues of the man supplement those of the woman to form a felicitous union. Such a marriage is a blessing to the persons married and to society at large. The more that men and women rightly prepare for matrimony, the more will they attain the ideal felicity of wedlock. No contract in life means so much as that which joins man and woman together in matrimony.

Marriage is not only the basis of society, it is also the basis of individual happiness. No matter what success a man or woman may have in life, if the home be not a place of peace, sympathy and mutual consideration, life becomes a failure.

On the other hand, let life's struggle be ever so hard, and its vicissitudes ever so many, if in the home there be sympathetic understanding, it is possible and easy to bear the severest or-

deals. A good marriage is one of the greatest assets in life. No wonder, therefore, that mankind is so much interested in matrimony.

The state is concerned about marriage because public welfare depends on it more than on any other one thing. Where family life is normal, there you will find a strong state, a happy state, a successful state. Let family life decline and you have a weak state, a discontented state, and soonor or later a discredited state. Most people, however, are not concerned so much about the state and its future as they are about themselves and the present.

In the present time it is safe to say that more persons have met with misery on account of an unsatisfactory marriage than from almost any other cause whatsoever. The number of broken homes in consequence of unfortunate marriages is simply appalling. This deplorable condition is not due to the nature of marriage, but to the thoughtlessness, recklessness and selfishness of those who contract it. Everything human is open to abuse. The best things in life may become evil by wrong use.

The most salutary drugs may become deadly poison if not used right. Marriage if not properly regarded may engender misery instead of happiness. If a person considers that marriage

is only a lark, or a life-long honeymoon, or a selfish partnership, or a game in which one may enjoy the thrills but decline the knocks, he should not be surprised if marriage turns out to be not only a failure, but a catastrophe.

Marriage is one of the most serious things of life. After the flame of first love abates, wedlock becomes very commonplace. Nature has attached certain allurements to sex union in order to bring men and women together for the serious duties of family life. Some people fancy that marriage must be one long round of love-making. When disillusionment comes, and husband and wife settle down to normal married life, they are apt to get into a state of dissatisfaction unless they regard marriage in its true nature. Young people are inclined to believe that life for them will be different from what they have observed in their own homes. In their own family circle things were, to say the least, quite prosaic. Their notion of love, however, colors the future with poetic charm and makes them look forward to marriage as a protracted romance.

It is true that marriage may be a life-long romance. Ordinarily, however, it is stern reality. The man has to work hard to support his family, and the woman must bear the burden of household duties, and attend to the delicate and

responsible task of rearing the children. The poetry of wedlock is all very fine provided it does not unfit man and woman for the routine of ordinary married life. For after the first glamour of marriage wears off, it is ordinarily a very matter of fact existence, with its joys and sorrows, its failures and successes, its misunderstandings and reconciliations, its thrills and its depressions, its duties, responsibilities, anxieties and compensations. Marriage is not a panacea for the cares of life. Rather it adds to them. But it also gives man and woman the mutual sympathy, consideration and support which will enable them cheerfully to meet the cares and burdens of their state of life.

It will thus be seen that marriage is no trifling affair. And yet, at the present time, many people rush into it as though they were going to a movie or on an excursion, rather than taking the most vital step in the journey from time to eternity. A good marriage is undoubtedly the most helpful thing in life. Most people who approach marriage in the right way find it satisfactory. Since it is the means designed by the Creator to carry on His plans concerning mankind, marriage naturally appeals to every normal man and woman. Since marriage means so much to mankind, and is moreover necessary for

the perpetuation of society, men and women ordinarily welcome sound advice on how to make and preserve a happy marriage.

The first thing necessary for those contemplating marriage is to have a right idea of what it is. Marriage does not change a person's nature. What a person is before marriage, that he will be ordinarily after marriage. Character and disposition seldom change. One of the most essential things for those who contemplate marriage is a mutual knowledge of the character and habits of each other. Frequently young persons join in wedlock because of external attractiveness. No matter how great may be the appeal of external charm, unless the character and disposition of both man and woman be agreeable, marriage in their case will be a misfortune. It is a commonplace to say that love is blind. But often it is necessary to have recourse to a commonplace statement in order to emphasize a truth.

A person under the influence of any passion is blind. Love is the strongest of all passions. The passion of anger makes a man say and do things which in his calm moments cause him to wonder how he could have acted in the way he did. We speak of blind rage. Under the spell of this distemper, a man fails to see conse-

quences and acts disastrously to himself and others.

Love blinds no less than rage. Persons under the spell of love see only what they desire to see in the beloved. We all know how partial parents are in their estimation of their own children. Defects which others readily see in children are often hidden from their parents. Good qualities which others cannot observe in children are conspicuous to doting father or mother.

And so with those in love, they magnify good qualities and minimize or altogether overlook defects in the beloved. But passion does not last forever, whether it be that of anger, love or anything else.

With those who marry, the intimacy of wedlock discloses both virtues and defects previously unnoticed. Moreover familiarity disillusions. The result is that after a time husband and wife see and know each other for what they are. Men and women should, therefore, endeavor to learn, before contracting matrimony, if they be suited to each other temperamentally and otherwise.

It should be borne in mind that those contemplating marriage usually show at their best in the pre-marriage period. As both man and woman desire to make a good impression on

each other, it follows that each is apt to see the other in the most favorable light. For this reason, wise youths and maidens will be guided by the advice of those who have their real welfare at heart. Young people may be sure that their parents are as desirous of a good marriage for their children as the children themselves are. Many a marriage has turned out disastrous because heedless children turned a deaf ear to the solicitous advice of father or mother. Even when all care possible is taken, there is no guarantee that marriage will be a path of roses. But the surest way to make it a rosy path is to use every means that common sense dictates in order to have one's comrade on life's journey as suitable as possible.

After marriage there are several factors which contribute greatly to a blissful union. The first is, that both husband and wife should always have each other in mind in whatever they plan to do. The man is no longer an independent unit, nor is the woman. Each belongs to the other. This is not a restriction of liberty, but rather an enlargement of it, because the more that husband and wife show consideration for each other, the more they receive from each other. The more that the husband really lives for his wife, the more he lives for himself, be-

cause marriage is a partnership, and whatever either one puts into it redounds to both.

There is no better rule for marriage happiness than for each to live for the other. The more that each one lives for the other, the more does each one really live for oneself, for it all comes back with interest. There is no single thing which so much tends to disrupt marriage as for either husband or wife to branch out for oneself. If the man consider only himself in his plans, he may, it is true, have his own way, but at the dreadful price of marriage infelicity. In the same way, if the woman should look mainly to her own enjoyment, regardless of her husband, it will only be a question of time when the home will be disrupted. Not that husband or wife should be exacting of each other, but that each should study the other with a view to mutual accommodation.

Marriage is give and take. Both husband and wife have their faults as well as their virtues. It should be the effort of each to make allowances for whatever is defective in the other. The very best persons have their shortcomings. If we cannot ourselves be all that we should like to be, how may we expect others to be what we want them to be? Mutual tolerance of each other's weaknesses will do more to make

marriages happy than almost any other single thing.

The first year of marriage is the most critical. It is during this period that husband and wife either accommodate themselves to each other or fail to do so. If man and wife succeed in adapting themselves to each other and to home conditions, a good marriage life is assured. It is during the first year that this mutual adaptation is in process of formation.

Selfishness is the great enemy of a happy marriage. The man or woman who looks only to what suits one's own personal aims and diversions must not be surprised if marriage turn out disastrously. On the other hand, the man or woman who considers primarily the welfare and pleasure of the other, will not fail to find in marriage the solace, peace and sympathy which so much contribute to welfare in life.

Compromise is the law of success. By this is not meant a surrender of what is right, but the broad outlook on life which makes one realize that one cannot have everything one desires. Nothing in this mortal life is ideal. Perfection is something to aim at, but one must not be disheartened if one fail to attain it.

The surest way to attain the utmost marriage felicity is to realize that as each one expects

consideration for oneself, so should one show it for the other.

Married life like single life has its vicissitudes. In marriage, however, a person has a companion to share sorrows as well as joys. A burden borne by two loses half its weight. The support of a family and the rearing and education of children is indeed both an anxiety and at times a heavy burden. But it has its compensations. It makes life worth living.

Parents live over again in the lives of their children. A father has a wonderful incentive to plan and work for his offspring. A mother has the greatest gratification of life in seeing her children develop before her eyes into manly youths and dutiful maidens.

Married life has, indeed, its responsibilities, but it also has its recompenses. The responsibilities of father and mother towards each other and to the children whom God gives them is a serious charge. To bring up a family right is no small undertaking. It is filled with duties which affect both time and eternity. It requires and receives aid from above if marriage be what God intends it to be.

Marriage was instituted by the Creator Himself when He said that it was not good for man to be alone. Having joined our first parents

in wedlock, He proclaimed: "A man shall leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they shall be two in one flesh" (Gen. ii. 24).

The Son of God solemnly affirmed of this union "What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6).

Marriage, therefore, is a serious affair both for time and eternity. Christian marriage has been elevated to the dignity of a holy alliance, a sacrament of Christ's own institution. The Son of God concerned Himself with few things of a worldly or material nature, but He did concern Himself greatly with marriage. What Christ affirmed of marriage is God Almighty's pronouncement on it.

The Catholic Church voices the declarations of Christ on marriage. It makes all the difference in the world whether or not we regard marriage as God regards it. The doctrine of the Catholic Church on marriage is not the teaching of man but of God. The Catholic Church has not invented her marriage teaching, but has received it from her Divine Founder. She merely proclaims what He affirmed.

Nowadays outside the Catholic Church marriage has to a great degree lost the dignity which the Son of God has conferred upon it. The Catholic Church alone proclaims what

Christ proclaimed: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." The Catholic Church has never, and never will annul a validly consummated marriage. The Catholic Church upholds the marriage contract as did Christ.

Is the Catholic Church right or is she wrong in her stand on marriage? It all depends on whether or not her founder is divine. If Christ, the Founder of the Catholic Church, is true God, and if He established His Church to perpetuate His ministry, and guaranteed her to be infallible in teaching mankind religious truth, then her teaching on marriage is that of God.

Before we take up the various questions relating to Christian marriage, we shall lay a solid foundation for the teaching authority of the Catholic Church on matrimony. We hope to demonstrate that what the Church of Christ declares about marriage is the declaration of God Himself.

In these days when marriage is by many considered something that man may deal with as he likes, it is well to point out the true nature of marriage, and to show that it has for its stability the sanction of the Author of human nature itself. With this in view, we propose to show, in a way which will convince reasonable

minds, that the Catholic Church has the sanction of God Almighty on her teachings concerning marriage.

Once that persons are convinced that the Church's Legislation on marriage is God's legislation, they will gladly abide by it, knowing that in the end God's way is the best way.

After it has been established that God speaks by the Church He founded, we shall be prepared to accept, as from His lips, the teaching of His divinely commissioned Church. We request all those who are seriously interested in marriage problems to give close attention to the immediately following chapters which establish the right of the Catholic Church to speak in God's name on this subject.

The chapters dealing with the actual problems of marriage will lose half their significance and efficacy unless one be firmly convinced that the Catholic Church is God's voice in the world on matters concerning His revelation to mankind. The perusal of these chapters, which immediately follow, will serve to strengthen the faith of those who believe, and to convince nonbelievers that if the truth of God be anywhere on earth, it is in the Church of which the Divine Founder declared: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. . . . He that heareth you,

heareth Me. . . . Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (John xx. 21; Luke x. 16; Matt. xxviii. 20).

These were not idle words. They meant what they declared. We know, therefore, that there is in the world now a Church which speaks in God's name and with His authority. We know, therefore, that what the Catholic Church teaches on marriage and divorce and birth-control and sex matters generally is the teaching of Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God. In order that the sincere inquirer after truth may fully realize that, when the Catholic Church speaks on sex matters, it is God that speaks, before stating the Church's doctrine on marriage and related subjects, we shall give the solid reasons for absolute faith in the teaching of Christ's Own Church.

CHAPTER IV

Christ True God

THE most momentous question for mankind is: Who and what is Christ? On the answer to this question depend our dealings with our fellow-man, our outlook on life, our attitude towards affliction, and our beliefs concerning the grave. If we believe that Christ is God, we shall regard His precepts and teaching as the very ordinances of God, and in living by them, have the assurance that we shall eventually share His everlasting blessedness. If, on the other hand, we do not believe that Christ is God, we must reject Christianity as a fable and believe that Christ was an impostor and blasphemer, or, at the least, a victim of hallucination.

It was a common-sense philosopher who declared that Christ was either divine or demented. Consider for a moment what Christ affirmed Himself to be, and judge if any sane person who was not an impostor could make such claims.

Jesus said: "I am the light of the world" (John viii. 12). Who but an insane man could

affirm that of himself unless he was truly divine? Again, He set Himself up as a model for all mankind: "Learn of Me, because I am meek, and humble of heart" (Matt. xi. 29). No mere man would presume to proclaim himself the exemplar of mankind. To speak thus, if Christ were man only, would be insane arrogance.

What man would dare proclaim as Christ did: "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me although he be dead, shall live" (John xi. 25). None but the Creator may assure life after death. Unless Christ was what He claimed to be, how could He presume to say: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations, . . . and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 18-20).

These and similar declarations of Christ must be the raving of a maniac unless He was truly God. Not even an impostor would make such claims, for they would be so preposterous as to engender ridicule rather than credence. Even an impostor must have a sense of proportion.

It is clear, therefore, that unless we regard Christ as mentally unsound, we must accept

His claims. But the most hostile critics of Christ do not for a moment consider that He was insane. The verdict of the learned world is that Christ was the most perfect being, mentally and morally, that this world has known. He who is the most perfect being is neither fool nor fraud. We must therefore accept Christ, since His testimony cannot be discredited.

As all Christians know, the *Incarnation* means that God became man. This does not mean that God was turned into man, nor that God ceased to be God and began to be man; but that, remaining God, He assumed or took a new nature, namely, human, uniting this to the divine nature in the one being or person—Jesus Christ, true God and true man.

At the marriage feast at Cana, the water became wine at the will of Jesus Christ, the Lord of Creation (John ii. 1-11). Not so did God become man, for at Cana the water ceased to be water when it became wine.

An example which may help us to understand in what sense God became man, but yet one that does not perfectly illustrate the matter, is that of a king who should of his own will become a beggar. If a mighty king should leave his throne and the luxury of the court, and assume the rags of a beggar, live with beggars,

share their hardship, etc., in order to improve their condition, we should say that the king became a beggar, yet was also truly a king. It would be correct to say that what the beggar suffered was the suffering of a king; that when the beggar atoned for something, it was the king that atoned; etc.

Since Jesus Christ is God and man, it is evident that God, in some way, is man also. Now in what way is God man? It is clear He was not always man, since man is not eternal and God is. At a certain definite time, therefore, God became man by assuming human nature. What do we mean by *assuming human nature?* We man that the Son of God, remaining God, took another nature,—namely, that of man,—and so united it with His own that it constituted the one person, Jesus Christ.

The Incarnation, therefore, means that the Son of God, true God from all eternity, in the course of time became true man also, in the one Person, Jesus Christ, consisting of the two natures, the human and the divine. This, of course, is a mystery. We cannot understand it any more than we can understand the Trinity.

There are mysteries all about us. We do not understand how the grass and water which cattle live on are converted into their flesh and

blood. A chemical analysis of milk shows no ingredient of blood in it, yet the milk which a babe receives from its mother's breast is changed into the flesh and blood of the child. The mother herself does not know how the milk is produced in her which she gives to the child she suckles.

All the wise men in the world cannot explain the connection between thought and speech. We should not be surprised, therefore, if we cannot understand the Incarnation. We believe it because He who has revealed it is God Himself, who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

It may be objected that this is to prove the Incarnation by the Incarnation. Let us consider this point. Christ asserted that He was the eternal Son of God. But anyone may make an assertion. When Christ, who certainly was a man, claimed that He was also God, was His claim substantiated? Did He give evidence that in making this stupendous claim He was stating the truth? This is the crux of the whole matter.

Christians affirm that Christ did give evidence to corroborate His assertion. No one is a Christian who denies or doubts that Jesus Christ is true God and true man. In order, however, to fortify Christians against the assaults of Ra-

tionalists and others such, and in order also to afford non-believers reasons for faith in Christ as God, we shall review briefly the evidence for our faith in Christ as the Son of God. We shall go about this matter in the same way that a court of law proceeds when a case is before it for adjudication.

If a man makes a statement before a tribunal and it is disputed, he must corroborate it in a way that will convince reasonable minds. If the man's intelligence be sound, and his character above reproach, and if besides he bring respectable witnesses to confirm his statement, and if in addition he adduce other evidence of a corroborative nature, all of which substantiates his assertion, his testimony will stand. If, moreover, his testimony does not benefit him, but on the contrary causes him very serious loss and suffering, it is evident that any jury which is open to conviction would accept his testimony.

The intelligence of Christ is acknowledged by the learned world to be the soundest known to mankind. The character of Christ stands out as the most upright in the annals of history. The corroborative evidence furnished by Christ is the most convincing ever presented for any claim. In Christ, therefore, we have a witness who is intellectually sound, morally upright,

and in addition supported by confirmatory evidence of the most convincing character. In brief, Christ stands out as the highest type of person that ever witnessed to a fact, and in addition, presents incontrovertible evidence to substantiate His testimony.

Are we to believe Him, or to brand Him as a shameful impostor? He is, on His own testimony, either God or a fraud. The most perfect being that was ever in this world was not a fraud. Even those who are unwilling to admit that Christ is divine assert that intellectually and morally He towers above the rest of mankind. In point of fact, Rationalists have glorified the character and intellect of Christ as highly as His most ardent followers. They grant Him everything but divinity.

Harnack, prince of Rationalists, has this to say of the character of Christ: "The sublimity which emanated from the person of Christ is as divine as any appearance on earth of the divine has ever been" *(Gesprache mit Eckermann,* viii., 148). Here Harnack concedes that Christ's character was as near to divine as this world has known.

Rousseau makes a similar admission: "Can the person whose history is recorded in the Gospel Himself be a mere man? What gentleness,

what purity in His morals, what a touching charm in His teachings, what sublimity in His principles, what profound wisdom in His discourses, what presence of mind, and what apt frankness in His replies, what control over the passions!" (*Oeuvres*, ii., 280). This can be said of no other human being.

Pfleiderer, another Rationalist, says that Jesus is "a heroic personality which in triumphant majesty passed over the earth, and is still today the redeeming and formative power which lends to human life both in its details and essential character a merit and value that outlast the temporal" (*Entstehung des Christentums*, ii., 11, 108).

It would be difficult for the most devoted adherents of Jesus to give Him higher human praise than these Rationalists have bestowed on Him. From the very camp of those outside the Faith, therefore, we have the highest testimony to the moral character of Christ. Let us see what men of this same type say of Christ's intelligence.

Julius Kögel thus refers to Christ's mentality: "A universal and illuminating frankness permeates His discourses and gives, particularly to His metaphors and parables, a unique and wondrous charm, impregnating them with a glow

of the clearest and most splendid colors. In them there is revealed an insight into the things of this world, the significance of which Jesus has absorbed with His sharp and penetrating glance, and whose value, even if naturally only a relative one, He frankly acknowledges, since He makes use of them for the elucidation of His thoughts" (*Probleme des Jesu,* p. 35). Nothing shows keen mentality so much as the power of discernment and comparison. Kögel, in that passage, attributes this power in supreme degree to Jesus.

Let us hear Harnack on this same point: "Jesus never spoke like an exalté or fanatic, who sees only one burning point, and for whom on that account, all the rest of the world and all that is in it vanishes. He delivered His sermons and looked out into the world with a clear, fresh perception of the great and the small in the life which surrounded Him. He proclaimed the fact that the gaining of the whole world is of no importance if the soul be lost; and yet He remained sympathetic for and interested in every living thing" *(Wesen des Christentums,* p. 22).

We could go on piling up testimony from outside sources to the moral and mental sublimity of Christ, but what we have adduced is sufficient

to show that no human being is entitled to credence if it be not Jesus Christ. We content ourselves with giving as character-witnesses to Christ those who are not of His faith, because if even those outside so highly commend Him, it is proof positive that His mentality and veracity are above questioning. If a man of Christ's character were today put on the witness stand, would it be possible to doubt the truth of his testimony?

But besides His character, Christ presents other credentials for His divine claims. Knowing that He made the most stupendous claims ever heard among mankind, He realized the need of substantiating them. He made supernatural claims. Supernatural claims demanded supernatural confirmation. This, Jesus supplied. When He perceived that in spite of His ascendency over the people His claims staggered them, He said: "If I do not the works of My Father, believe Me not. But if I do, though you will not believe Me, believe the works: . . . they give testimony of Me" (John x. 25-38).

Christ claimed to be God Almighty, the Creator of the world. Yet in appearance He was as the rest of men. The Jews had an inexpressible reverence for God. So far did this reverence go, that they did not pronounce His

name, but used a symbol instead. *Jehovah* was the Maker of heaven and earth, the Ruler of the universe, the Lord of life and death. Is it any wonder that the Jews were not only amazed but stunned when Jesus affirmed that He was the eternal and infinite Lord of time and eternity. How could the Creator be a creature; the Infinite, finite; the Eternal, temporal? Jesus perfectly understood their mental attitude, and for this reason condescended to confirm His claim by deeds which were directly possible to Almighty God alone.

Miracles are the sign-language of God. They are the divine seal put upon a man and a mission, stamping them as true. When a monarch puts his seal on a document, it signifies royal approval of its contents. When a government sends an ambassador to a foreign court, it puts its seal on his credentials, to signify that his mission has government confirmation. So when God puts His seal on a man or a mission, it is God's confirmation on that person or mission. God cannot approve of error. Hence a miracle is divine confirmation of what it is associated with, because a miracle is directly or indirectly the work of God, and hence God's approval on what it confirms.

The prophets of the Old Testament and the

saints of the New performed miracles, but always as the agents of the Almighty. They called on God to manifest His power in order to confirm the truth of their cause. But not so did Christ perform miracles. His miraculous deeds were done in His own name by Himself directly.

To the corpse that was the son of the widow of Naim, which was being carried out to burial, Jesus said: "Young man, I say to thee, arise" (Luke vii. 14), and in response to the Creator's direct command, the corpse became a living being. To the leper, Jesus said: "Be thou made clean" (Matt. viii. 3), and straightway the leprosy left its victim. To the cripple, lying helpless on a cot, He said: "Arise, take up thy bed, and walk" (John v. 8), and the paralyzed man leapt to his feet perfectly sound and whole. To the sinner, Jesus said: "Thy sins are forgiven thee" (Matt. ix. 2), and in confirmation that his sins were truly forgiven, Jesus restored the cripple to soundness of limb, showing that the words which gave his body health also healed his soul (Matt. ix. 6, 7).

None but God can directly forgive sin. The Jews knew this, and when Jesus pronounced forgiveness on sinners, they thought in their hearts that He was guilty of blasphemy, because

none but God can forgive sin (Mark ii. 6, 7). Jesus, who read their hearts as we read a book, told them their thoughts, saying: "Why do you say in your heart that I am a blasphemer because I forgive sins? It is true that none but God can forgive sin, and to show you that I am God, I will now do what is possible to God alone. In My own name I will say to this paralytic: 'Arise!' that you may know that My words have the efficacy of God." Then, turning to the paralytic, He spoke the word, and the man who was carried to the feet of Jesus on a bed, took up his bed rejoicing, and returned home sound of soul and body (Mark ii. 11, 12).

Again at the grave of Lazarus, Jesus demonstrated most unmistakably that He was what He claimed to be. Before performing this, His greatest miracle, He made it a test of the truth of His divine claims. There were assembled at the tomb of Lazarus the most distinguished men of Jerusalem, members of the Council and of the Sanhedrin. Before this critical gathering, Jesus gave the greatest possible proof of His divine claims. He, as it were, challenged doubters. He proclaimed to the bystanders that what He was about to do was in order to call His heavenly Father to witness to the truth of His claims and mission. Raising His eyes to

heaven to His eternal Father, He stated His reason for the impending miracle—"that they may believe that Thou hast sent Me" (John xi. 42). Then as the expectant multitude looked on, He cried out to the corpse which had already begun to corrupt: "Lazarus, come forth" (John xi. 43). The clay obeyed the voice of the Creator, and became instantly a man, perfect in health and faculties.

It was after this stupendous display of divine power that the Jews poured out from Jerusalem and met Jesus on the way. Cutting down branches from the trees, they waved them triumphantly before Him, crying out: "Hosanna to the Son of David, blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord" (Matt. xxi. 9). The Jewish leaders then hastily called a council, saying: "What do we, for this man doth many miracles? . . . Do you see that we prevail nothing? Behold, the whole world is gone after Him" (John xi. 47; xii. 19). It is this Jesus who testifies to the truth of the Incarnation.

It is on the word of Jesus Christ that we believe that God became man. Are we to believe Him? If not, no man in the history of mankind can be believed. No person that ever lived is so worthy of credence as Jesus Christ. His moral character is the highest conceivable. He

alone of all men could say: "Which of you shall convince Me of sin?" (John viii. 46). He alone could point to Himself as a model: "Learn of Me, because I am meek, and humble of heart" (Matt. xi. 29). His morality and mentality have never been approached on this earth.

This Jesus is our authority for the truth of the Incarnation. Besides His sublime integrity and keen mentality, His deeds speak for Him. Never in the history of the world was there such a witness to a fact as Jesus Christ is to the Incarnation. It is on His word that we base our belief in the Incarnation. Faith that rests on such a foundation is eminently reasonable, even though it be concerned with what is above reason to comprehend.

It may not be generally known, but it is a fact that the Catholic Church has had to defend the humanity of Christ in past ages as it now feels obliged to uphold His divinity. In former ages, the person of Jesus was so wonderful in the eyes of Christians that some maintained that He was not really man, but such in appearance only. Against these persons, the Church proclaimed that Jesus Christ was true man, like unto us in all things, sin only excepted. Christians in that era had no doubts concerning the divinity of Christ. In their estimation He was so divine

that some could not reconcile human nature with His perfection.

Jesus, the perfect human being, the one man in the history of mankind who could point to Himself as a model for humanity, the one man of all men who could openly challenge the world to accuse Him of sin, the one man who performed deeds never before done since the foundation of the world, this man solemnly proclaimed that He was the eternal Son of the eternal Father, that in all things He was equal to the Father.

Christ affirmed that He was God, although He knew that His affirmation would cause Him to be sentenced to a death of pain and shame. Before the tribunal of the High Priest,—the highest sacred tribunal of the nation,—He solemnly swore that He was the true Son of God. The High Priest put Him on His oath: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us if thou be the Christ the Son of God" (Matt. xxvi. 63). Jesus answered: "I AM" (Mark xiv. 62).

It is clear that the High Priest, in using the term *Son of God,* meant it in its real sense; otherwise, he would not have pronounced the answer of Jesus blasphemy. If Jesus did not mean to affirm that He was God in the sense that He was Jehovah, there could be no grounds

for the accusation of blasphemy. As it was, He was declared guilty of death because, as the Jews stated to Pilate, being man, He made Himself to be God (John xix. 7).

That Christ meant to affirm that He was true God is evident from what He had previously said: "I and the Father are one" (John x. 30). Before that, He had proclaimed that there was one God only (John xvii. 3). When therefore He stated that He and the Father were one, He made Himself God, as the Father was God. At the baptism of Jesus, the Father bore testimony that Jesus was the divine Son of God, saying: "This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased" (Matt. iii. 17).

Unless, therefore, the Incarnation is a fact, the bottom drops out of Christianity. Unless Jesus Christ is God, He is the most criminal impostor this world has known, for, believing on His word, millions of the best men and women of the human race have gone to death to uphold their faith in His divinity. Jesus Christ is guilty of more bloodshed than all the tyrants of history if He is not God as He solemnly declared.

It may be asked, why is it that in view of Christ's perfect moral and mental character there are those who refuse to accept His claims

to divinity? Perhaps the chief reason is, that if they believe that Christ is God, they must live by His precepts. They are willing to admit that He is everything but God. They are even willing to admit that He is divine in a certain sense,—that is, that He above all other men was most highly favored by Almighty God, and in consequence most nearly approached the divine ideal.

But all this is mere evasion and self-deception. For if Christ is the highest expression of the divine in man, He surely was neither deranged nor a deceiver. And if He was neither deranged nor a deceiver, He was what He claimed to be,—the eternal Son of the eternal Father, God Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth.

Alexander, Cæsar, Aristotle, Plato and other persons of antiquity are accepted by mankind as creditable historical personages. Christ is more of a historical personage than any of these, but is not credited by worldly people. They can believe in Aristotle without having to regulate their life by his teaching. That is the difference, and that explains in great measure the attitude of those worldly people who deny that Christ is God.

Christ has done His part to save us. It rests with ourselves to do our part. He was crucified

because He maintained He was God in the true sense. He was worse than a fool or impostor to die willingly for a false claim. But He sacrificed His life that we might have eternal life. He died that we might live forever. It makes all the difference in the world to mankind whether Christ was God, or a deranged impostor.

Truly the most momentous question in the world is: *Who and what is Christ?* The Catholic Church answers that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, equal to the eternal Father in all things; that He established a Church which was to last forever and teach unerringly His doctrine; that this Church is consequently in the world now, teaching with His certainty and authority; and that Catholicism is as true as God.

CHAPTER V

Christ's Church True As God

IT is as clear as day that if Christ's Revelation was for all mankind to the end of the world, His Church to which He entrusted His Revelation was to be in the world to the end. Also it is evident that if Christ commanded mankind to hear the Church as it would hear Himself, the Church must in some way be Divinely preserved from false religious teaching. Christ would not command mankind to believe in His Church, under eternal penalty, unless she was to teach what He ordained she should teach.

In giving the Church her Divine commission, Christ said: "All power is given to Me in heaven and in earth. Going therefore teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 18-20).

If His Church were ever to be a teacher of

religious error, and man were commanded nevertheless to believe in her, Christ would be responsible for false doctrine. Christ has so intimately identified Himself with His Church that He has said of her: "He that heareth you, heareth Me" (Luke x. 16). Unless by His Divine power He had devised a means of preserving His Church from error He had never spoken those words.

It may be asked how can a teaching Church, constituted as it is of fallible men, be infallible? That is God's affair. Christ would not be God if He could not, without doing violence to man's free will, safeguard His visible and living representative from erroneous teaching.

If Christ's Church were not infallible it could not be His representative. St. Paul declares: "For Christ therefore we are ambassadors" (2 Cor. v. 20). Can we imagine Christ being represented by ambassadors of falsehood? If Christ did not establish a Church which was to speak with His certainty and authority He left mankind no sure way of knowing what He taught, nor what service He wanted of them. As Christ did not write a book nor carve His teaching on imperishable material nor blaze it permanently across the sky, how was it to be conveyed to successive ages? Unless, in some

way, He had provided that His doctrine should infallibly reach mankind to the remotest period of time, it could not be said that His teaching, as He has given it, was for all men.

If, even with Christ's guarantee of infallibility, there are those who say that it is impossible that a Church should be infallible, what was the use of Christ's founding a Church at all? But He has established His Church and given His Divine word that it shall not err and His word has not failed, and cannot fail because He is God.

His Church therefore must be, as it were, the perpetuation of Himself in the world. Perhaps that is why He said to His disciples: "If the world hate you, know you that it hath hated Me before you. . . . If they have persecuted Me, they will also persecute you: if they have kept My word, they will keep yours also" (John xv. 18-20). By this declaration Christ virtually identifies Himself with His Church. Consequently we should expect the Church which is truly His, to speak with His truth and with His authority—that is, with the truth and authority of God.

If a Church be uncertain as to what it should teach, or if it have no authority back of its teaching, it is a misnomer. For why a Church

at all if it be not the voice of God? And if it is the voice of God it must be certain and authoritative. Recently a prominent clergyman asserted that his religion was to have no religion. What he meant by this was, doubtless, that he would accept no Creed. In that case Christ might just as well never have uttered the Sermon on the Mount and His other teaching.

The Christian Creed is the teaching of Christ. This teaching had to be transmitted in some way. Unless it were authoritatively transmitted it could not be surely transmitted, for in the course of transmission it could be altered and distorted, unless done under authoritative supervision. The Founder of Christianity knowing this, established a living institution to impart His teaching to succeeding generations of mankind. It was this living institution—which He called His Church—that gave us the Gospels in the early period of Christianity, and has authoritatively supervised their transmission down to the present day.

They who affirm that they will not accept authority in religion contradict themselves, for they accept the Gospels which would never have reached them except by the authority of the Church. The Gospels did not drop from the sky, nor after being written did they preserve

themselves. The reason why we have the Gospels today just as they were written by the Evangelists some two thousand years ago, is because the authoritative Catholic Church most carefully transmitted them down the ages.

Those persons who say that their religion is not tied up with any Creed, but consists only of faith in Jesus, would not have true knowledge about Jesus except for the authoritative Church which proclaimed and recorded and handed down to posterity the life and teaching of Jesus.

Moreover they who assert that their religion is faith in Jesus and not in a Creed, overlook the fact that it is impossible to believe in Jesus without believing in a Creed. CREED means DOCTRINE OR TEACHING. The Apostles' Creed is the teaching of Jesus as proclaimed by the authoritative Church founded by Jesus. It is impossible to have faith in Jesus and not to have faith in what He taught. What He taught constitutes the Christian Religion or Creed. To affirm, therefore, faith in Jesus and at the same time to ignore the teaching of Jesus is a contradiction.

It virtually comes to this, that they who say that they adhere to no particular religion, but to Christ Himself, do, by that very fact, discredit Christ who not only gave to the world

a definite religion but, moreover, commanded man to accept it under penalty of rejecting Him. He said of His Church: "He that heareth you, heareth Me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me" (Luke x. 16).

When Christ gave His Church its Divine charter, He commissioned the Apostles to teach all things whatsoever He had taught them. What was that but a Creed,—a definite Reigion? If a person does not believe that Christ is God and that He established a Church, the logical thing to do is to discard Christ altogether. To hold to Jesus and yet to ignore His teaching, is not only a contradiction but also an insult to the Founder of Christianity. Those who accept Jesus but not the Christian Creed, are simply throwing dust in their own eyes. Those who affirm that they want no intermediary between themselves and Jesus but want to go direct to Him, forget that they must go to Him in His way—not theirs. Every human being may go direct to Jesus; and the more they do so the better. But they must not think that they can go to Jesus and yet ignore His express command to hear His Church as they would hear Himself. Catholics go direct to Jesus continuously and devoutly, but they go as reverent children of the Church He has founded.

Some people want to go to a christ of their own creation. They tell themselves what they will believe, and then aim to go to Jesus and accept from Him only what they wish to believe. This is really not going to Jesus but going to themselves by an indirect and misleading way. Many have tried to go to Jesus in this way, and the result is that they returned with a religion of their own. This is why there are several hundred denominations claiming to be Christian Churches. It is evident that all these contradictory denominations could not have come from Christ, because He could not tell some one thing, and others the opposite. He could not reveal to some persons that He was Divine, and to others that He was not. He could not tell some that His Church was infallible, and others that an infallible Church was impossible. He could not declare to some that the Mass was a holy Sacrifice, and to others that it was idolatry. He could not teach some the necessity of Baptism, and others that it did not matter.

It is very well for people to say that they ignore Creed and that it is best to go direct to Jesus; but He has told us how we must go to Him, and if we go not in His way we shall never approach the real Christ. One may go in one's

own way to a Jesus of one's own creation, but not to Him who said: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican" (Matt. xviii. 17). The error of the day is religion making. Almost anyone can get a religious following by starting a new worship or a new Creed. It is characteristic of these man-made religions that they are really self-worship rather than Divine worship. They cater to one's own desires and impulses, and as a rule point out an easy way of ascending the mountain of God.

But an easy or self-chosen path is not always the right path nor the safe path. If a traveler should assert his independence of authority by preferring to follow his own guidance over a trackless territory rather than trust to an accredited guide, he would be considered foolhardy. Yet this is what they do who affirm that they will not accept authority in religion. Although the Gospels which they believe to be the word of God state that Christ established an accredited and authoritative Church, they prefer to follow their own way rather than that pointed out by the Light of the World — Jesus Christ. Of course such persons are flagrantly inconsistent, but they seem not to advert to it. They declare that they will not take anything

on authority, and yet they take on authority nearly everything in daily life. Not one person in a hundred thousand verifies for himself the various things which go to make up the creed of life. We take on authority the prescription which a physician gives us. The State which licenses a physician is our authority that he is qualified to practise medicine. We take on authority the filling of the prescription by the druggist. We are not qualified to judge whether the filling of the prescription is right or not. It may be a deadly or a remedial potion that he hands to us. But we take it on the authority of the State which has licensed him, and that is as far as we go in the matter. When we step into a taxicab we believe that the chauffeur is competent on the authority of the licensing body.

It is very much so at every turn of life. From childhood to old age our lives are almost entirely lived on authority. Children are reared by parental authority. Older people live by the authority of teachers, officials, specialists and documents.

We have greater reason for accepting authority in religion than in anything else. The Gospels, which give us our knowledge of Jesus Christ, state that He is God. It is Jesus Christ

who is our Authority for authoritative religion. To say, therefore, that we will not believe on authority—that we will not take our religion on authority, is equivalent to saying that we have not faith in Jesus. We base our trust in licensed officials on the faith we have in the State. We could not hold that we had faith in the State and at the same time declare that we would not recognize the right of the State to license various practitioners. Those who assert that they will not accept a Creed on authority, do not really reflect on the significance of what they say. They imagine that in some way authority in religion conflicts with reason. They believe that to accept religion on authority is to surrender reason. But it is the very contrary!

It is most reasonable to be guided by those who are better qualified than ourselves in any matter in question. When passengers board a trans-Atlantic liner they do not act unreasonably because they submit to the authority of the Captain of the vessel. They realize that they know little or nothing about navigation, and that entrusting themselves to the Captain's guidance and authority is highly reasonable. When a chemist declares that certain things are poisonous, we do not consider it unreasonable

to avoid them on his authority. A business man, no matter how capable he may be, does not think it unreasonable to follow in legal matters the advice of a lawyer.

Professional people themselves respect and submit to the authority of specialists in their own profession. There are doctors who are consulting doctors to the medical fraternity. Also there are lawyers whose practice is almost exclusively confined to counseling lawyers. Physicians and lawyers do not act unreasonably in following the authority of leaders in their profession. If a person specializes in a certain matter he is better qualified to speak on it than others who are too much occupied in other respects to concentrate on the matter in question.

For a person to say that he will not take religion on authority is to go against the universal practice of mankind in the other affairs of life. Not one person in a million verifies for himself the findings of scientists but accepts their statements on authority. In religious matters people who believe on authority do not do so blindly. If they did so, faith would be neither reasonable nor advisable. As reasonable beings we should use the reason that God has given us to make sure that authority is duly accredited. Once it is established that the authority in ques-

tion is entitled to credence and trust, it is reasonable to accept and follow it.

The story is told of the leader of a newly-founded sect, that he approached a distinguished lawyer in order to have him join the new Creed. The lawyer, after listening awhile, said to the man: "Why certainly I'll become a member of your religion, but on one condition—that you die on Friday and rise from the grave on Sunday." That ended that. Catholics do not yield to the authority of the Church without the best grounds in the world for credence. It is safe to say that no authority on earth has been subjected to such rigorous investigation and close scrutiny as that of the Catholic Church. Catholics, as well as the rest of mankind, dislike authoritative regulation of their lives. Catholics are as much opposed to religious dictation as other men. But being convinced that the Church of Christ speaks with the authority of God, they willingly submit to her teaching and rule.

A man who consults a physician of standing may not like the treatment prescribed for his cure, but if he have faith in the physician he will willingly abide by his directions. Before a man has faith in a physician he must have grounds for his faith, whether it be the report of other

cures, or the respect in which the physician is held by the medical fraternity. If serious illness and treatment be in question, the invalid takes every precaution to learn if the physician be trustworthy and competent. Once that is established he freely yields himself to the guidance of his medical authority.

So it is with Catholics. The Catholic religion imposes on its adherents a lofty morality which calls for the control of strong passions and the sacrifice of not a few things in which human nature delights to indulge. When we realize that the Catholic Church has numbered among her subjects some of the greatest intellects known to mankind, it becomes evident that they would not submit to her authority without making sure that she was Divinely authorized to exercise it. In the early ages of the Church to become a Christian was to incur the risk of losing property, liberty and life. The early Christians were as much attached to these things as are we. Unless they had the strongest possible reasons for adhering to the Church of the Martyrs they never would have made such heroic sacrifices. The first Christians were mostly Jews. They must have had invincible proof that the Church was Divinely authorized.

St. Paul was not only a Jew but a persecuting

Jew. He was so opposed to the Church of Christ that he employed all his influence and energy to destroy her. Saul, the persecutor, must have had the most convincing reasons for becoming Paul, the Apostle. Saul not only became the Apostle St. Paul, but moreover endured all manner of privations and suffering in order to convert to the Christian religion his own race and also the Gentiles of various races. St. Paul must have had unmistakable proof of the truth of the Christian Church to endure the hardships which for many years he experienced in propagating the religion which he formerly opposed.

A mere enumeration of his labors and sufferings must convince us that a man of his powerful and penetrating intellect would not have yielded to the authority of the Church without reason. In a few lines he states briefly the price he paid for his adhesion to and propagation of the Church of Christ: "Of the Jews five times did I receive forty stripes, save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once I was stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day I was in the depth of the sea. In journeying often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness,

in perils in the sea, in perils from false brethren. In labor and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness" (2 Cor. xi. 24-27).

Yet in spite of hardships, contradictions and disappointments he continued on to the end, rejoicing to do and suffer in order to make the Church of Christ known and revered and obeyed. In the midst of such trials he exclaimed: "Who then shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation? or distress? or famine? or nakedness? or danger? or persecution? or the sword? . . . But in all these things we overcome because of Him that hath loved us. For I am sure that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor might, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. viii. 35-49).

Unless he firmly believed that the Founder of Christianity was God, he never could have served the religion of Christ so ardently. And unless he had the strongest possible reasons for believing he never would have believed. It was no easy matter for him, a Jew of Jews, to proclaim Christ, whom the Jews had crucified as a

blasphemer, to be the Son of God. Paul HAD proof that Christ had risen from the dead. He knew that Christ's claims therefore had the seal of God on them. He knew that the Church founded by Christ was the Church of God. Thus believing he counted as nothing the sacrifices he had to make in order to submit to the Church and to extend her dominion over mankind. Catholics have been from the beginning of Christianity the closest possible students of Christ and His Church. In all ages they have been obliged to make too many sacrifices for their religion to accept it without due credentials. Although it be true that, as in all other organizations, there are many Catholics who accept without questioning the authority of their Church, yet they do so, not blindly, but because of the faith they have in the integrity and intellect and scholarship of their more learned associates, and because the Faith, as they know it, is absolutely convincing.

Catholics believe that Christ, the Founder of their Church, is God. They believe that in religious matters their Church speaks with the truth and authority of God. They have faith in their Church as they have in God Himself. Moreover they are convinced that no Church can be Christ's which does not speak with His

authority and with His certainty. With this faith in their Church, Catholics endeavor to live as their Church ordains.

Not all those who have the name of Catholic live up to their Creed. But Christ, the Light of the World, manifests His light to them, and through His Church upholds the right standards of morality. While Christ was on earth not all who heard Him believed Him, not all who believed in Him lived by Him. But to "as many as received Him, He gave them power to be made the sons of God" (John i. 12).

CHAPTER VI

The True Nature of Marriage

HAVING seen the deplorable state of affairs brought about by false ideas on morality, we should now be prepared to hearken to the voice of Truth itself, on the vital matter of marriage and its related subjects.

Jesus Christ, who is the Way, the Truth and the Life, has once for all proclaimed the nature of marriage. Any doctrine on matrimony different from His is false, and bound to be detrimental to mankind. He who made man and woman, and instituted marriage, is best qualified to state the nature of the union which makes man and woman to be husband and wife. Christ has spoken clearly and repeatedly on the nature of marriage.

In the tenth Chapter of the Gospel of St. Mark we read the following declaration of the Son of God: "From the beginning of the creation, God made them male and female. For this cause a man shall leave his father and mother; and shall cleave to his wife. And they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore now they are not

two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder" (Mark x. 6-8).

That is how God regards marriage. That is what the Author of nature thinks of the nature of the bond uniting husband and wife. In the judgment of Him who made man, and Who instituted the Sacrament of Matrimony, the marriage tie constitutes husband and wife a unit. It makes them one corporate whole, so closely knit together that no one but God Himself may sever the bond. This union is so firm and sacred that not even the claims of father or mother may take precedence of it. Any weakening of the marriage bond results in the weakening of society itself. Morality generally will be high or low in accordance as marriage is respected or discredited.

Marriage was never in lower esteem than at present, and never was morality so deplorably low. Man cannot improve on God. Even if there were no hereafter, God's ways are best for human welfare. Every time an ordinance of God is ignored, either the individual or society suffers. The worst possible fallacy is to presume that God's laws are intended to hamper man. As well say that a guide over a dangerous and unknown tract hampers the wayfarer. The pro-

tecting railing of a narrow foot-bridge is not to restrict the liberty of the traveler, but in order to save him from a false step into the deadly chasm below. God's ordinances are for man's safe guidance over the perilous path to eternity.

It is a mistake to assume that the Catholic Church has made marriage indissoluble. God has made it indissoluble. The Church founded by God merely transmits and proclaims the truths He entrusted to her. This cannot be made too plain. The Catholic Church has originated no doctrine. Her doctrine is what was committed to her by her Divine Founder.

St. Paul distinctly and emphatically declares this truth. He says: "For I give you to understand, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached by me is not according to man, for neither did I receive it of man, nor did I learn it; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. i. 11, 12).

What this Apostle so solemnly proclaimed, the Catholic Church has affirmed in every age since. Her doctrine is not of man, for she did not receive it from man, nor devise it herself, but it came to her from her Divine Founder. She was made the Custodian of the revelation given to man by the Son of God. She was made the Trustee of His message to mankind. Her

doctrine is the trust-fund committed to her to preserve and transmit even unto the consummation of the world.

She received her divine commission from the very lips of God Himself. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you. . . . Going therefore teach ye all nations . . . whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world" (John xx. 21; Matt. xxviii. 19, 20).

No delegation was ever more plainly made than that. "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you."

In order to emphasize the fact that His Church was to proclaim His doctrine and to speak in His name Christ declared: "He that heareth you heareth Me."

The first thing, therefore, that we must understand about marriage is that what the Catholic Church declares concerning it is the declaration of God. The Church of Christ declares and has always declared that no power on earth can dissolve a valid and consummated marriage with right to remarry. In thus proclaiming, she but repeats the solemn teaching of Christ.

Let us hear His pronouncement with regard to the stability of the marriage bond. "Every one that putteth away his wife, and marrieth

another, commiteth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery" (Luke xvi. 18). Nothing could be clearer than that.

If any one knew the meaning of Christ's words it was the Apostles. St. Paul writing to the Romans on this subject says that a woman "Whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man" (Rom. vii. 3).

The same Apostle writing to the Corinthians declares as follows: "To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried" (1 Cor. vii. 10). Nothing could be more clearly enunciated than that.

Circumstances may dictate that a wife separate from her husband, but under no consideration may she re-marry, while he lives.

When we come to treat of divorce, we shall take up the objections which advocates of divorce make against the perpetuity of the marriage bond. Suffice it to say here that until the so-called Reformation in the sixteenth century, divorce was something unknown in Christendom. If during all these centuries the Catholic Church was wrong in her teaching on marriage,

Christ's Church was in error from the beginning. In that case Christ's guarantee failed, and both He and His Church should be relegated to the great frauds of history.

But Christianity was not wrong during the centuries between Christ and Luther. Nor did it require sixteen centuries for the true meaning of Christ's teaching to be made known. The Apostles knew the mind of Christ better than the Reformers, so-called. What becomes of Christianity if for sixteen centuries Christ failed in His promise to be with His Church?

It is clear, therefore, that we must accept marriage as indissoluble or reject Christ and Christianity. The indissolubility of marriage and the truth of Christianity stand or fall together.

In the Acts of the Apostles we read that in the interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension, Our Lord conversed frequently with the Apostles on His Kingdom, the Church. What the Church of Christ taught and instituted about the Mass, the Sacraments, Marriage and other vital Christian matters, was doubtless conveyed to the Apostles during these conferences on the Kingdom of God. It was for this reason that the Apostles declared that they did not receive the Christian truths from men but

from God. It was for this reason that the Apostle said, "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach a gospel to you besides that which we have preached to you, let him be anathema" (Gal. i. 8). Unless Christianity's teachings were divine, such language as that of the great Apostle would be blasphemy.

Until the Reformation introduced divorce into the world, Christians almost universally believed in the indissoluble nature of marriage. Up to the Reformation, the indissoluble nature of marriage was never questioned, except by the Greek Church, after its schism in the eleventh century. If this belief of Christians was false during all those centuries, Christ was responsible for it, for He commanded mankind to hear the Church as it would hear Himself. If the Christian doctrine of the indissolubiilty of marriage was false, Christ was false. He was not God, and the sooner revealed religion is eradicated from mankind the better.

It simply comes to this, either the teaching of Christianity about marriage from Christ's day to the Reformation was true or false. If it was true, marriage is indissoluble, if it was false, Christ's Church failed, and the basis of Christianity crumbles.

It is understandable that infidels, pagans and

others such should refuse to believe in the indissoluble nature of marriage, but how any one who is a Christian can differ from Christ is incomprehensible to a logical or consistent mind. If there was any possible exception to the indissolubility of the Christian marriage tie, it would have been stated by the Church during those sixteen centuries. The fact that the Church which Christ appointed as His spokesman never admitted nor declared an exception, is proof-positive that there was none. This is made the more evident by the Pauline privilege, which from the very time of the Apostles allowed a convert from Judaism to leave a Jewish husband or wife who refused to agree not to molest the convert in the practise of the Christian religion. The Church of Christ allowed, and still allows the convert in such a case to separate from the infidel spouse and to marry again, provided it be to a Christian. This exception was proclaimed by St. Paul by the authority of Almighty God. It has been recognized in the Church from the beginning.

Apart from this exception made by divine Authority, no valid marriage has ever been dissolved by the Church of Christ. God alone, who instituted marriage, has the right to dissolve it. When God proclaimed the indissolu-

bility of marriage, He did so, not arbitrarily, but because the nature of marriage required it. God always acts wisely and reasonably. He did not promulgate the Ten Commandments in order to interfere with man's liberty, but to ensure his welfare.

It will be found on analysis that every one of the Ten Commandments are for man's real good. The Commandment for instance not to steal, protects man's possessions. The Commandment not to kill, protects man's life. The Commandment not to lie, protects man's character. The Commandment not to commit adultery, protects man's wife, mother and daughter. And so with the rest of the Commandments. They are all based on the requirements of nature. They are intended to safeguard mankind against passion and violence.

So with regard to marriage. God made it indissoluble because human welfare demands it. Marriage ordinarily results in parenthood. Children require constant and permanent care. The mother needs the support and protection of the father of the children. If marriage were not indissoluble, the wife would hesitate to become a mother. If this should be lawful in one case, it would be so in another, with the result that the very object of marriage would be frustrated.

Children are the most helpless offspring in the whole range of living beings. Most animals are self-caring a few days after birth. A child is absolutely dependent on a mother's or nurse's care for years. Even after the child is physically capable of looking after itself, it requires care and supervision for its moral and intellectual formation.

Stability of the marriage tie is, therefore, postulated by nature itself. This has been recognized by the best of civilized nations everywhere, and at all periods of human history. The marriage of one man to one woman, and the permanency of the bond, have constituted the basic social law of nearly every civilized people from the beginning of the world. Wherever and whenever this law has been abrogated, it has resulted disastrously to society.

We need but to look at the direful consequences of marriage dissolubility in our own day, in order to see that nature resents any infringement on her essential code. We shall consider this aspect of the case more in detail when we deal with the subject of divorce.

Nature draws man and woman together for a purpose. This purpose demands the stability of marriage. When, therefore, Christ proclaimed, "What God hath joined together, let no man put

asunder" He was voicing nature's need as well as God's law.

God does not force man to obey His Commands. The Creator made man free and wants him to serve freely or not at all. The Author of nature, if He wished, could force man to do the divine Will, as He forces the rest of visible creation. All nature necessarily does God's will. Material nature does it by the arbitrary laws of physics, and chemistry, which are the expressions of the Will of the Creator, and which carry out absolutely the purpose He intends. Animal nature does the Will of the Creator by instinct which rules them with iron hand. Man alone of all visible creation is free to map out his own course, to obey or disobey the mandates of nature, to serve or defy his Maker. If it were not for passion, everyone would be convinced that permanence of the marriage tie was necessary, even apart from the divine Command. But because of human selfishness and passion man wants to be a law to himself. He resents any restriction on his inclinations. He mistakes license for liberty. He forgets that indulgence of his own desires may be injustice to others.

Man wants to act with regard to marriage as if he were his own master instead of being the subject of a higher Power. But God who has

endowed man with free will has not relinquished authority over him. Along with the liberty which the Creator has bestowed on man goes responsibility. Man in due time must render to his Maker an account of how he has employed the precious gift of free-will. God made man free, not that man might ignore the divine precepts, but that by freely observing them, he should do what was meritorious for eternal life.

Christ has once for all proclaimed the nature of marriage. He has declared that it is a bond which no earthly power may sever. Man has it in his power to accept or reject Christ, but not to accept Christ and reject His teaching. The teaching of Christ on marriage is that it is a tie which unites until death sunders it. The experience of mankind proves that Christ is right, for wherever and whenever there has been a slackening of the marriage bond, disaster has overtaken individuals and society.

It must be borne in mind that He who instituted Marriage a Sacrament, and declared it to be indissoluble, was God, the Author of nature, the Maker of man. When it is said that marriage is indissoluble, it does not mean that circumstance may not at times advise the separation of husband and wife. But this is not divorce, not a sundering of the bond, because it

does not permit either party to marry any one else. Again when it is said that matrimony is indissoluble, it means valid matrimony.

Marriage is a contract, and like any contract may be valid or invalid. A civil contract to be valid must be executed according to the state laws. If a person under legal age makes a contract, it will not legally bind the contracting parties. Or, if a person be obliged to sign a contract under fear of violence, it will be declared null and void by the Courts. There are other conditions under which a civil contract would be declared invalid, but those which we have specified are sufficient to illustrate what we are to state concerning the marriage contract.

Christ solemly proclaimed the nature of marriage when He declared that it constituted man and wife a unit which none but God Himself may asunder. "They two shall be in one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." Having proclaimed the unity and indissolubility of matrimony, Christ left to His Church the details regarding the contract by which man and woman become husband and wife.

Christ instituted all the Sacraments, but left to His Church the manner of administering them. His Church was for all mankind and

for all time. In everything but essentials the Church may modify whatever her judgment dictates. At one time the Holy Eucharist was administered under both forms of bread and wine. In the early ages of the Church the Sacrament of Penance was accompanied by various ceremonies not now employed. There are several different rites for the administration of Baptism. But in all these cases it is only in external forms or accidental conditions that there has been variation.

The Eucharist is essentially the Body of Christ whether under the form of bread or wine or of both.

The Sacrament of Penance is the remission of sin by Almighty God, through the priest, regardless of the specific form in which the forgiveness is imparted.

Baptism is birth into the supernatural life by the action and words decreed by Christ, regardless of the ceremonies which may accompany the essential rite.

So with regard to Matrimony, Christ has proclaimed that the contract which makes man and woman to be husband and wife is indissoluble, but He has left the manner of making the contract to His Church.

In the beginning of Christianity, the Church

sanctioned marriage between Christians and Jews, also between Christians and Pagans. At that time, the Church in her wisdom saw that it was advisable to permit such unions. But with the growth of the Church and under changed conditions, she modified her legislation regarding matrimony. Even today in various parts of the world there are various rites and ceremonies and conditions in the administration of the Sacrament of Matrimony by the Catholic Church. Regardless of the ceremonies of the contract, provided it be done as the Church prescribes at the time and place of the marriage, the contract is valid and indissoluble. Of course, when we say indissoluble we mean a dissolving of the contract with the right to marry another.

Separation is not divorce in the ecclesiastical sense, as we shall point out when dealing with divorce. The Church, which is a divine society, has the right and power to legislate on religious matters, just as the State, which is a civil society, has the right and power to legislate on civil matters. When Christ said: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you" (John xx. 21) He conferred on His Church that plenitude of power by which she can legislate in His name on whatever pertains to the rites and ceremonies of religion.

During the forty days between the Resurrection and Ascension, Christ conversed familiarily with the Apostles about His Church. It was doubtless in these conversations that He outlined, in a general way, the procedure which the Church was to follow in administering the Sacraments.

At various times the Catholic Church has decreed various essential conditions to be fulfilled in order that Matrimony should be validly contracted. If any of these conditions be omitted the Church declares beforehand that the contract is null and void, and she regards the parties as not married, and treats them as single persons. If her subjects heed not her voice, but continue to live together after an invalid union, she declares that they are not living as man and wife, and that they must stand the consequences before the eternal tribunal of God. Men and women may defy the Church, but they defy God in so doing. God has given man free-will, and he may use it against the Giver if he will, but God has His own time and way of asserting His divine Authority.

God does not force man to keep the Ten Commandments but only enjoins him to do so. In like manner, Christ does not force the faithful to obey the Church, but commands them to do so.

Catholics may disregard the Church of Christ, and contract marriage against her decrees, but they are defying God in so doing and must be prepared to stand the eternal consequences.

The word Catholic means Universal. The Catholic Church alone is universal, that is not limited to any time, place, race or government. She legislates for mankind. Christ in giving her the commission to teach His religion said: "Go ye into the whole world . . . and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world" (Matt. xxviii. 20). A law which is universal may work hardship on individuals here and there. But hardship does not excuse one from keeping the State law, nor does it excuse from keeping the ecclesiastical law. Every beneficial law known to man causes inconvenience and suffering to individuals. But law is made for general welfare, and if the good of society demand it, the individual must respect it regardless of its effect on his personal aims and condition.

Christ, the Author of human nature, knew what was best for mankind when He instituted marriage as an indissoluble union. None but a divinely instituted Church could uphold the doctrine of Christ as it has been upheld. Unless the Catholic Church was divine, it had long ago

made concessions to human passion, such as we see other Churches have done. To uphold marriage, as Christ has ordained, the Church has sacrificed at various times whole nations. She is not responsible for the perverse will of those who defy her, but she is responsible for the deposit of faith confided to her by her divine Founder. Marriage indissolubility is part of that deposit, and come what may, the Church of Christ will safeguard and uphold it until time is no more.

CHAPTER VII

Divorce

LAST year, 1929, there were 205,102 divorces in the United States. This means that on an average there were 561 divorces every day of the year.

In certain sections of the country one out of every three marriages ended in divorce. The average for the entire country was one divorce to every six marriages.

One of the most serious problems of our age is that of divorce. This problem is becoming more acute every day. It is evident, to reflecting minds, that unless marriage regains its solemn significance society is doomed. Bad as the evil of divorce is, it is only a symptom of a worse evil. It is a proclamation that man is a law to himself, that pleasure rather than duty should rule, and that there is no accountability to a higher power for one's conduct in life.

It is clear to any one who thinks seriously, that neither society nor the individual can long survive a course of conduct which leaves nature's laws out of consideration. Divorce, with right

to re-marry, disregards nature's laws. Nature draws man and woman together for something more than mutual pleasure. Nature employs sex gratification and companionship for purposes of her own. Without the family society would perish. Without society the human race would hardly survive.

The marriage of one man to one woman, and the permanence of the union, are the dictates of normal human nature.

This is the age of science. People refer everything to science and claim to abide by her decision. The decision of science may well be followed. The unfortunate thing about it, however, is that pseudo-science is often the arbiter instead of science. Science cannot be at variance with truth since science is established truth. But false theory often sits on the throne of science and misleads the unwary. Science, true science, proclaims only what investigation confirms.

What does the science of biology teach us about marriage? Biology can only offer us the results of investigation and tell us what she concludes about marriage. But although Biology cannot give a scientific decision on marriage, her conclusions all tend to confirm the Christian doctrine on marriage.

In these days, when a scientific pronouncement is received by many as Gospel truth, even when the pronouncement is far from scientific, it is a satisfaction to find that the latest biological researches show that the marriage of one man to one woman, and the permanence of the union are nature's provision. Professor H. S. Jennings, Director of the Zoölogical Laboratory, and Professor of Zoölogy in the Johns Hopkins University, in his recent book, entitled, *The Biological Basis of Human Nature* states that "The Monogamous family, with its life-long union of mates, appears as the final term of a long evolutionary series."

It may not be superfluous to state that marriage may be of three kinds, known as polygamy, polyandry, and monogamy. Polygamy is the union of one man with several women. Polyandry that of one woman with several men, and Monogamy that of one man with one woman. Professor Jennings declares that Biology teaches monogamous marriage.

The *Literary Digest*, July 5, 1930, commenting editorially on the findings of Professor Jennings says:

> "Thus does Professor Jennings smash some newfangled notions that marriage is a

late invention which has no support in human nature, and should, therefore, be discarded in favor of some more modern device for the satisfaction of the mating desire and the propagation of the race.

"Monogamy has been subjected to sundry attacks on the general ground that it is not a complete fulfilment of human requirement and well-being, and is, therefore, without any actual sanction; companionate marriage has been offered as a substitute —even the complete abolition of marriage has been suggested—and State-owned and controlled creches for the raising of children have been put forward as a device to relieve marriage of its implied obligation to the race.

"But Professor Jennings finds that we can not so easily dispose of marriage. Research convinces him that it is the fulfilment of biological laws. Thus does biology give its sanction—if such sanction were needed—to the religious idea that marriage is a permanent bond, not to be broken without peril."

True science will always be in accord with Revelation, for the Author of nature and the Author of Revelation are one and the same Person. God cannot say one thing by nature and another by revelation. Truth cannot contradict itself

Of course, the verdict of Professor Jennings is not presented as scientific proof that Christian marriage is the right form of human family union, but only to show that one of the highest living authorities on Biology finds that science confirms the Christian doctrine of Matrimony.

Christians, however, did not have to wait until the twentieth century to know that Christ's teaching on marriage was true. Christians believe that Christ is God, and that consequently He can neither deceive nor be deceived. But in this material age when so many persons have been alienated from religion by the declarations of immature scientists, it is gratifying, to say the least, to see a distinguished scientist coming to the support of religion in the matter of one of its fundamental tenets.

Developing the statements made above, Professor Jennings goes on to say:

> "Marriage and the family, even lifelong monogamous marriage, are not an invention that is original with man. These institutions, in various forms, have been worked out independently by many different organisms. There is little doubt that our ancestors had them before they were men. Certainly many organisms that are not men now have them. In many animals exist powerful biological influences that favor a

cooperative career of the parents lasting for more than one season, or for life.

"The attraction of the mates for each other, combined with the effect of habit, itself acts powerfully in this direction. In the eagles, hawks, and other birds of prey, this keeps the mates together for life; a permanent monogamous marriage is here found. Successive families of young are produced, and tho there intervene periods in which the parents are without young, the union of mates is for life.

"In other animals this tendency toward a permanent cooperative life career on the part of the two parents is powerfully reinforced by the long period of dependence of the young. The development of the offspring to maturity requires not one season, but many. The two parents, caring jointly for the young, remain together. The offspring come, not in broods, but singly. Succeeding children overlap in their developmental careers. There is no time when the two parents can separate without breaking in upon the functions they have undertaken in relation to the young. Such is the situation we find in the higher anthropoids, in the orang and gorilla; such is the situation found at its highest development in man.

"To break the mating relation at any particular time is to bring all this into confusion; is to leave children and mate in distress; is to leave unfilled the mating im-

pulse; is to force the separated mates anew into the intensely distracting pursuit of finding a new mate.

"All this is avoided by the mates remaining together.

"Even as age comes on, and the last of the offspring has taken up its own career, so that the biological relations with progeny no longer require cooperation on the part of the parents, long use and habit, the persistence of the need of companionship, keep together the two parents. Marriage is lifelong, even tho the care of the offspring is not. Permanent monogamous marriage has arisen independently, through similar functional requirements, in the mammals and in the birds; the biological needs giving origin to it being much the more numerous and powerful in the higher mammals."

Thus far Professor Jennings.

There is much superficial talk about the opposition of science to religion. Let it be clearly understood that there can be no conflict between religion and science. Whenever there is alleged conflict it is because either science or religion is falsely represented.

Christ has proclaimed concerning marriage: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

A distinguished spokesman for science declares that nature confirms what Christ affirms.

Christianity has brought it about that marriage throughout the civilized world is monogamous. Almost every civilized nation now recognizes monogamy as the only lawful union of man and woman. For a thousand years after Christ the permanence of the marriage bond was recognized throughout Christendom. It was only when the Greek Church separated from the Church of Christ that divorce was introduced among Christians. Later the Reformation opened the divorce door wider. But always the Church of Christ upheld and still upholds and will always uphold the permanence of the marriage bond. Today divorce has made such inroads into society that outside the Catholic Church marriage has to a great extent lost its true character.

Divorce has made marriage such a trifling matter that persons enter upon it with less consideration, frequently, than they would in making a business contract. Young people, seeing that they can break the bond almost at will, do not hesitate to form an alliance which, if not satisfactory, may be ended in a few months or a few years. Marriage in consequence has de-

generated into an experiment instead of being the most stable and serious affair of life. Young married people realizing that separation may sever their relations any time, decline to assume the duties of parenthood, for fear that it might be a handicap to another union later on. Not infrequently husband or wife deliberately give cause for divorce in order to form a new union with a newer attraction.

Christ in making marriage a Sacrament, and proclaiming it indissoluble, was conferring a real benefit on mankind.

It is safe to say that never before in the history of the world was the marriage bond so loose or so transient as it is now. And it is also safe to say that never before was there so much social unhappiness. Divorce is not the remedy for marriage ills. Divorce creates divorce. Those who have been married and divorced two, three or four times find that human nature is human nature in the later marriage as well as it was in the former.

One reason for marriage infelicity is that persons knowing the bond may be severed enter upon marriage without the care and consideration they would exercise if they knew the union was to last until death severed it. Some people rush into marriage with less knowledge of the

character and antecedents of each other than they have of business partners.

Divorce creates divorce. The knowledge that the marital contract is only temporary not only makes persons unsuited to each other marry, but after marriage it makes them fail to accommodate themselves to each other, and to make allowance for each other's shortcomings. A successful marriage demands mutual consideration and adaptation. Where the bond is permanent, each realizes the necessity of mutual accommodation. Differences of temperament and judgment are bound to occur even among the most congenial companions. These differences will be adjusted ordinarily, if it is realized that the parties must live together permanently. But if the bond be regarded as temporary, these differences will gradually widen the breach until the modern disease of incompatibility results.

Incompatibility was never heard of until easy divorce made it a fashionable ailment. Our forefathers had the same nature as ourselves, but they were strangers to incompatibility. They made the best of bad circumstances and by so doing frequently converted them into favorable conditions. With divorce in view, however, people prefer incompatibility to patience and other domestic virtues.

Divorce creates divorce. The realization that the bond may be easily broken causes man or woman to act with sexual laxity towards attractive acquaintances. Sexual license so abounds at the present day that married men and women in certain social circles almost take marriage infidelity for granted.

Divorce creates divorce. Witness the sad condition of the family life today. In the United States one out of every six marriages ends in divorce. In some States one out of every three marriages terminates in the divorce courts. Nature condemns divorce. Experience condemns divorce. God condemns divorce.

Neither nature, experience nor God compels man to obey, but nevertheless disobedience to nature, experience or God exacts a penalty sooner or later. Sexual Vice pays a high tax. The toll on sex license is terrible in the long run.

It may conservatively be said that if the standard of marriage maintained by the Catholic Church were to be lowered, society would soon degenerate into the very same deplorable condition which has caused disaster to every nation which has countenanced divorce. In this present age of religious skepticism the only reasoning which will appeal to worldly people is that which affects temporal and material wel-

fare. Divorce, as we shall see, is opposed to both. It is a matter of experience that nature's laws cannot be violated with impunity. The permanence of the marriage bond being nature's law as well as God's, disregard of it is bound to re-act disastrously.

Pope Leo XIII, in his Encyclical "Arcanum Divinæ," which was published in 1880, long before present conditions could have been foreseen, stated:

> "*Divorce once being tolerated, there will be no restraint powerful enough to keep it within the limits fixed or foreseen.* Great is the force of example, and the violence of passion even greater. With such incitements it must needs follow that the eagerness for divorce, daily spreading by devious ways, will seize upon the minds of many like a virulent contagious disease, or like a flood of water bursting through every barrier. These are truths that are clear in themselves, but they will become clearer yet if we call to mind the teachings of experience. So soon as the road to divorce began to be made smooth by law, at once quarrels, jealousies and judicial separations largely increased; and such shamelessness of life followed that men who had been in favor of these divorces repented of what they had done, and feared that, if they did not carefully seek a remedy by repealing

the law, the commonwealth itself might suffer disaster."

It must be plain to the casual observer that the evils from divorce thus predicted by the Holy Father fifty years ago have not only come to pass, but have immeasurably surpassed what he feared. Particularly in the United States do we see the dreadful inroads into family welfare made by divorce. In Oregon last year (1929) there was a divorce to every two marriages. In Wyoming one to every three, and in Missouri one to every four. In these three States the average of divorces to marriages was one in every three.

If this is not appalling and alarming, it is because the greatest threat to social welfare is not recognized. If children result from these unions they are in the sad condition of being estranged from either father or mother. It is sad enough when death deprives children of father or mother. But in that case it is recognized as the Hand of God, and the departed one is not responsible for the bereavement. But when divorce deprives children of father or mother, the bereavement is accompanied by bitterness towards either one or other of the parents.

Countless are the blighted lives of children who have had to take part against father or

mother on account of divorce. Life-long bitterness has been engendered in those in whom only love and reverence should reside.

Divorced persons either marry again or remain single. If they re-marry, the children of the former marriage, if such there be, find themselves, ordinarily, in a very embarrassing environment. If the divorced persons remain single, the children are dreadfully handicapped in their education and prospects.

The family is the basis of society. Divorce shatters the family. Society consequently rests on a shattered foundation if divorce be general. With one divorce in every three or four marriages, it will be only a question of time when the social fabric will collapse.

Marriage is rapidly falling into disrepute by reason of the ease and frequence of divorce. Speaking of those who advocate divorce, Gilbert Chesterton says:

> "Such people say they want divorce, without asking themselves whether they want marriage."

Again, referring to the rapid degeneracy of marriage, and to those who champion divorce, he says:

> "They must surely see that in England at present, as in many parts of America in the past, the new liberty is being taken in the spirit of license, as if the exception were to be the rule, or, rather, perhaps the absence of rule. This will especially be made manifest if we consider that the effect of the process is accumulative like a snowball, and returns on itself like a snowball. The obvious effect of frivolous divorce will be frivolous marriage. If people can be separated for no reason, they will feel it all the easier to be united for no reason. . . . There seems no particular reason why a man should not elaborately calculate that he could stand a particular lady's temper for ten months; or reckon that he would have enjoyed and exhausted her repertoire of drawing-room songs in two years."

The fact that such a thing as companionate marriage can be broached is evidence that marriage has reached an alarming degree of frivolousness.

The Catholic Church does not recognize divorce. With her Divine Founder she proclaims that once a marriage has been validly contracted, nothing but death can separate the parties with right to re-marry. It is for this reason that she is so careful about marriage before it is contracted. She specifies the conditions under

which the Sacrament of Matrimony must be performed in order that it may be a valid marriage. She takes every precaution to safeguard marriage. Before the marriage is performed, she publicly proclaims the contracting parties on three different occasions, so that if there be a valid reason against the marriage, it may be made known.

Once the marriage is validly performed and consummated, no person or consideration on earth can make her dissolve it. Whenever it is stated that a Catholic has been divorced and allowed to re-marry, it is a misrepresentation. No Catholic has ever been allowed to marry another while his wife lived. The Church may find on examination that an alleged Catholic marriage was no marriage at all, and so declare. In this case, the persons are regarded as single and free to marry. But this comes under the head of Annulment, which will be considered in a separate Chapter.

Divorce is not Annulment. They differ as day does from night. Neither is legal separation divorce. Legal separation does not entitle either party to re-marry. This subject also will be treated in a subsequent Chapter.

The fact which we desire to make clear here and now is that Christ and nature proclaim the

indissolubility of marriage. Why, therefore, it may be asked, do some Christians maintain that the marriage bond may be dissolved? Why does every Christian Church in the world, except the Catholic, permit divorce with right to re-marry, if Christ forbade it? The Christian Churches which allow divorce and re-marriage, base their right to do so on their interpretation of the words of Christ:

> "I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery" (Matt. xix. 9).

These words of Our Lord were spoken in answer to a question by the Pharisees:

> "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" (Matt. xix. 3).

The Jews had multiplied the reasons for putting away the wife, and the question was asked in order to know if all these reasons were valid.

By "putting away" was understood legal separation, not divorce with right to re-marry. Before answering their questions as to legal separation, Christ solemnly re-affirmed the indissolubility of marriage.

"Have you not read that He who made man

from the beginning made them male and female?"

And He said:

"For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be in one flesh. Therefore, now they are not two, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 5, 6).

Christ did not reply directly to their question:

"Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?"

Instead, He proclaimed the sacredness of the relationship between man and wife. The Jews had degraded the marriage tie, as they had degraded other ordinations of Jehovah. They had multiplied the reasons for which a man might put away his wife. The Pharisees asked Jesus if these reasons were lawful. Instead of answering this specific question, He declared the sacredness of the marriage tie, affirming it was the institution of the Creator and that none but God had the right to dissolve it.

But the Pharisees rejoined:

"Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce, and to put away?"

Jesus saith to them:

"Because Moses by reason of the hardness of

your heart permitted you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so."

By these words Christ proclaimed that the marriage conditions prevailing among the Jews were an abuse, a departure from the ordination of the Maker of man.

Then, as He had come to restore all things, He proclaimed anew the doctrine on matrimony. He first answers their question about putting away the wife, and states that not for every reason, but for one reason only may a man permanently put away his wife, namely if she be guilty of fornication. He then adds that after putting away his wife, a man if he marry another committeth adultery. Here are His words:

"And I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife *except it be for fornication.*" This answers their question about putting away the wife. He then proceeds to affirm, what He had previously proclaimed, that even if a man put away his wife, for the only permissible cause, "and shall marry another he committeth adultery."

Some may object that this is an arbitrary interpretation. Far from it, as we shall proceed to show.

All jurists agree that a less clear statement

is to be interpreted by one that is more clear on the same subject. Christ made not one but many unconditional pronouncements on the nature of the marriage bond. In all these He affirms the indissolubility of the bond. The best interpreter of a statement is the one who made it. Such a one knows its meaning if any one does. Christ Himself interprets this text. He declared elsewhere, without any exceptional clause whatever, that "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her" (Mark x. 11). This is an absolute statement.

Again Jesus proclaimed:

"Everyone that putteth away his wife, and marrieth another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery" (Luke xvi. 18). This also is an absolute declaration.

There is no exceptional clause in it. Christ states that if the wife be put away, neither husband nor wife may marry another. This is in accord with His solemn proclamation:

"What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6).

From these declarations, it must be evident to those open to conviction that Christ made a sharp distinction between legal separation and

absolute divorce with right to marry another.

Next to Christ Himself, the best interpreters of His doctrine on Matrimony were the Apostles, who were not only in a position to know His mind in the matter, but who, moreover, were commissioned by Him to transmit and teach His doctrine. It was because the Apostles were delegated by divine Authority to speak in God's name that St. Paul stated: "For Christ therefore we are Ambassadors" (2 Cor. v. 20). An Ambassador speaks in the name and authority of the power he represents. Let us hear what the Apostle said regarding Christ's teaching on the marriage bond:

"A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth: but if her husband die, she is at liberty" (1 Cor. vii. 39).

In this passage the Apostle recognizes but one thing which may sever the bond, namely death. What St. Paul so emphatically states here he re-affirms in his Epistle to the Romans, when he says that a wife "Whilst her husband liveth, she shall be called an adulteress if she be with another man" (Rom. vii. 3).

And in order to make it evident that what he states is divine truth, he says:

"To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not

from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried" (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11).

Here again a sharp distinction is drawn between legal separation and divorce with the right to marry another.

In further proof that Christ taught the indissolubility of the bond of matrimony, we have the historical fact that in all Christendom there never was a divorce for the first thousand years after Christianity was established. During this period the Church of Christ proclaimed that the marriage tie was dissoluble by death only.

During these first thousand years of Christianity, the Catholic Church was the recognized Church of Christ. If she was wrong on Matrimony, she was a teacher of falsehood, and Christ's guarantee failed. If Christ's guarantee failed He was not God, and Christianity is a huge fraud, and the sooner it is abolished the better.

Both the Greek and the Protestant Churches when they separated from the Church established by Christ, made divorce lawful. At first they confined the cause for divorce to one thing only, adultery. But gradually they so widened its doors that divorce is now open on almost any pretext. To such an extent has Matrimony lost

its Christian character with many persons that it is no wonder that Chesterton said:

> "Such people say they want divorce, without asking themselves whether they want marriage."

It is conceivable that those who are not Christians should believe in divorce with right to marry another, but how those who believe that Christ is God, and that He established a Church to perpetuate His ministry and doctrine can believe in divorce is a mystery. It simply means that logic and consistency take flight when prejudice presides.

All Christian Creeds except the Catholic sanction divorce. Any doctrine on matrimony, however, which differs from that of the Catholic Church is the doctrine of man, not of God. The time, place and person that gave birth to every doctrine which differs from the Catholic Creed may be historically established. Every creed which sanctions divorce has sprung from some person or group that separated from the Church which goes back directly to Christ.

It is because Catholics know that divorce is forbidden by the Divine Founder of Christianity that they adhere to the doctrine of the indissolubility of Matrimony. For them it is enough

that Christ proclaimed this doctrine. They realize that divorce followed by marriage to another is a mortal sin. That ends the matter for them. Catholics know that they cannot practise divorce without renouncing their religion.

The dreadful condition of affairs in society brought about by divorce, confirms Catholics in their faith. They see that the violation of Christ's precepts on Matrimony leads to social disaster. Catholics do not close their eyes to the difficulties and hardships and misunderstandings of married life. But they realize that divorce is not the remedy for family ills. Catholics have their household trials as well as others. At times these may be of such a nature that legal separation may be advisable. This matter, however, will receive special consideration in a later Chapter.

Every law that is made for the general welfare rests at times very heavily on some individuals. Quarantine laws not infrequently impose dreadful inconvenience on individuals. But such laws are for the welfare of the public at large, and must be maintained. Taxes at times work extreme hardship on individuals, but government could not be managed otherwise. Public security of person and property would be al-

most impossible without the burden of taxation. The public weal demands at times personal sacrifice.

Christ legislated not for this or that race, not for this or that age, but for all mankind to the end of time. His legislation is for the welfare of universal society, both here and hereafter.

The nature of marriage is such that both for parents and children permanence is necessary, regardless of individual inconvenience. The human heart is fickle. Intimate association often leads to indifference. Man and woman, in the close and constant relationship of married life, are apt to lose some of the attractiveness for each other which previously drew them together. Unless the bond be permanent, a fresh attraction may easily take the place of the old, and lead to disruption. It is easy to find a cause for dissolving the bond if one has a new love in view.

With divorce as a remedy, little effort is made to tide over difficulties and misunderstandings. It is easier and more agreeable to discard an old mate for a new one than to adjust oneself to conditions and personal traits.

The real welfare, therefore, of husband and wife demands permanence of the marriage bond, regardless of the hardships which it may impose

in certain cases. When it comes to the children, there can be no question about the desirability and necessity of permanent marriage. Divorced people themselves lament the consequences to their offspring.

Human nature as well as Christian precept demands that children have the care of father and mother. Human nature as well as Christian precept demand that children be not set against father or mother. Divorce embitters children, ordinarily, against either parent, sometimes against both.

No matter how we regard divorce with right to marry another, it will be found in the long run to be detrimental to family and society. Should we be surprised, therefore, that the Church of Christ as well as nature condemns divorce? Difficulties and hardships do not justify people in breaking legal contracts, much less should they justify them in breaking nature's and God's contracts. For many centuries all Christendom respected the marriage bond, and were the better for it. Divorce has made a thousand times more unhappiness in the world than marriage fidelity with its various trials and vicissitudes. It is for this reason that to the Christian Our Lord says: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." To

the man without a definite religion, the Creator says: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." To all mankind the voice both of nature and experience cries out: "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder."

CHAPTER VIII

Annulment

THE public generally are surprised and shocked when they hear that a Catholic has had a marriage declared null and void, and that in the case marriage to another is permissible. People wonder why it is that the Catholic Church which condemns divorce, will nevertheless decree an annulment and grant those concerned the right to marry another.

There is all the difference in the world between divorce and annulment. Divorce means dissolving the marriage bond. Annulment is the declaration that in the case in question there was no bond. Divorce puts asunder those whom God has joined. Annulment proclaims that God has not joined the persons in question. Divorce breaks the tie of a valid marriage. Annulment decrees that there was no tie.

The civil government makes a clear distinction between divorce and annulment. Lawyers are familiar with the distinction.

The shock which comes to the non-Catholic public when a marriage has been annulled by the

Catholic Church is a compliment to the Catholic Church. It means that people consider the marriage standard of the Catholic Church so high that any lowering of it is a matter of astonishment.

But Annulment is not a lowering of the high marriage standard of the Catholic Church. From the origin of Christianity to the present day, the Catholic Church has never broken the bond of a valid Christian marriage. Marriage is a contract between two persons. Christ has elevated the marriage contract to the dignity of a Sacrament. A contract may be valid or invalid.

The State specifies the conditions for a valid civil contract. The Church specifies the conditions for a valid religious contract. If a civil contract does not comply with legal requirements, it is null and void. That is, it is no contract. If a religious contract does not comply with ecclesiastical requirements, it is null and void. That is, it is no contract at all.

A Catholic marriage, no matter how solemnly performed, is no marriage at all if it be not in conformity with ecclesiastical law.

The State will not break a valid contract, but if the case warrant it, will declare that there was no contract. The Catholic Church will never dissolve a validly consummated marriage, but

if the case require it, will declare that there was no marriage.

There is all the difference in the world between breaking a partnership, and there being no partnership to break.

Non-Catholics, however, at least those who are prejudiced or ill-informed, affirm that the Catholic Church has recourse to annulment in order to grant what otherwise would be allowed by divorce. They contend that the Catholic Church, which upholds the indissolubility of marriage, makes concessions to her subjects by annulment which is virtually equivalent to the granting of divorce.

A little investigation into this matter will show that no power on earth is so solicitous for the upholding of a contract as the Catholic Church is for that of marriage. Also it will be shown that never once since the origin of Christianity has the Catholic Church granted a divorce with right to marry another. Moreover, it will also be made manifest that annulment is no lowering of the matrimonial bars, but that on the contrary, it is a proof of the sacredness in which the Church holds the marriage bond.

In the first place, we shall consider just what annulment means. Every society or government has the right to specify conditions for

membership into the organization and for continuance in it. Persons born in a nation are by the very fact citizens. They naturally abide by the constitution and laws of the country. But those who wish to become citizens of a state to which they are not native, must solemnly declare that they will abide by its constitution and laws. Every state makes laws for the protection and welfare of its subjects. Among other things it safeguards commercial dealings among its citizens. In the transfer of property, the making of wills, the forming of business partnerships, and such things, in order to insure justice and stability, it states specifically the conditions which must be complied with in order that these arrangements may be valid and binding. If the conditions are complied with, the whole power of the state will uphold the agreements. If the conditions be not complied with, the courts will decree that the agreements were null and void, that is, that they are not binding, and that for all intents and purposes they are non-existent, and the parties are absolutely free from any obligation.

The Catholic Church is a religious society whose Founder is Jesus Christ. The Son of God, in establishing the Church to continue to the end of time the ministry which He had in-

augurated, empowered her with divine attributes. His commission to her was the most solemn and consequential ever given upon this earth.

"As the Father hath sent Me I also send you. . . . Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven. . . . All power is Mine in heaven and in earth. . . . Behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."

Christ empowered His Church to teach and rule in His name.

"He that heareth you heareth Me."

The Catholic Church, therefore, is a religious society, divinely established, for the spiritual welfare of mankind. As such she has her constitution and laws. Baptism is the initiation into this society. Once a person is a member of the Church, her constitution applies to him in all that concerns his religious life.

Matrimony is one of the seven Sacraments of the Church, instituted by Christ Himself, in order to sanctify the union of husband and wife. Christ has proclaimed the nature of the marriage contract, that it is indissoluble. He has left to His Church to specify the conditions of the contract as time and circumstances dictate. The Church has accordingly specified from time

to time the requirements for a valid marriage. The requirements have varied whenever the Church in her wisdom has deemed it advisable. Always, her object in specifying the conditions for valid matrimony was to show her reverence for it, and to impress the faithful with the solemn significance of the contract they were entering upon.

The State places many formalities about the sale of property, in order to insure a safe transfer to the purchaser. Once the transfer has been legally made, no power in the nation can undo the deed against the will of the new possessor.

The Catholic Church states specifically the conditions required for a valid marriage. She declares beforehand that a failure to carry out the conditions will nullify the marriage, no matter what ceremonies and pomp may accompany it.

Now, Annulment means simply this, that the marriage contract is proclaimed no contract at all because it was not validly executed. It may be objected that persons may take advantage of this to marry without complying with the conditions, and thus be able later on to separate if they wish, and marry another.

People who would thus marry would not care whether or not later on they could separate and

marry another. If they were willing to have a mock marriage, and live in adultery, they certainly would not respect a valid marriage which prevented separation and marriage to another.

Man may deceive man, but he cannot deceive God. It is possible for Catholics to falsify conditions, and have all the formality of a valid marriage, but in doing so they are defying God. If they want to live and die in that state, it is their own affair. God may be ignored for a time, but He has all eternity to vindicate His authority.

Annulment, therefore, is no weakening of the marriage bond, but a declaration that, in the case, there was no bond.

The State, in decreeing the conditions for a valid contract, specifies among other things that the party to a contract must be of sound mind, that he be of legal age, that he be free to make the contract, that the contract be concerned with what is lawful, etc., etc. If any of these conditions be lacking, the contract will be declared null and void, and the parties altogether in the same condition as they were in before they assumed to make the contract.

It is the same with the Church with regard to the marriage contract. If any of the conditions she specifies for the validity of the con-

tract be wanting, she declares that there is no contract and that the parties are as they were before they attempted to marry.

Nearly all the conditions which are required by the State for the validity of a civil contract are required by the Church for the validity of the marriage contract. There are some persons who say that annulment is a loop-hole established by the Church in order to grant re-marriage to those whom the Church desires to favor either for money or other considerations. As well say that the State regards annulment of contracts as a device for favoring certain of her subjects. It is the very reverse.

The purpose of annulment is to fortify a just agreement, by negativing a defective one. If there were no civil annulments, the crooks would have the honest citizens at their mercy. The fact that the Church decrees annulments is proof that she is vigilant over matrimony, not that she is lax or partial.

Moreover, if one considers the difficulty in securing a decree of annulment, one will cease to believe that it is a substitution for divorce. Before a decree of annulment is issued, the contract has been submitted to the most searching investigation possible to human care and ingenuity.

In point of fact, annulment is ordinarily such a protracted and difficult matter, that it is often a cause of complaint by those concerned. Not that the Church wants to discourage a just appeal, but that she is so concerned for the sacredness of the bond that she leaves nothing undone in order to make sure of the verdict to be rendered. Once the verdict of annulment is decreed, the parties to the assumed marraige are single, and entitled to marry another.

It may be objected that parties who are wealthy and influential may procure able legal talent and have recourse to various other measures by which they may unjustly obtain a decree of annulment. By bribery they may secure false affidavits and false witnesses. To this it may be replied that all those objections apply to civil annulments also, and that if laws were to be condemned because of the abuse they were subject to, every law would have to be abolished.

It is because passion may play an important part in the seeking of an annulment decree that the Church is so slow and careful in her procedure. Persons under the influence of passion will ordinarily stop at nothing which will further their ends. Hence, the Church in cases of annulment, particularly if it be evident that marriage to another is in view, takes nothing for

granted. Rather she takes for granted that the marriage in question is valid until it is proved beyond all question invalid.

However, when all is said, there are those outside the Catholic Church who maintain that annulment is a palliative for divorce, and that the Church while claiming never to grant a divorce, has her own devious way of catering to those who demand freedom from the bond, with right to marry another.

The best answer to this is, that at various times in her history the Church has rejected the plea of annulment from the mightiest and most influential personages on earth. Emperors, Kings, Lords and Magistrates have had their appeals denied just the same as common folk. Some persons may have the notion that annulment is a common affair, that it is a convenient loop-hole to enable Catholics to re-marry. This notion vanishes before the light of facts.

In the year 1927, only fifty-three cases of annulment came before the Roman Rota. Of these only twenty-eight received the decree of annulment. From over three hundred million Catholics, only fifty-three appeals for annulment were presented to the Roman Rota and of these more than half were rejected.

It may not be without interest to the average

reader to know something about the Roman Rota, the tribunal to which as a court of last resort marriage cases are referred. As supreme ruler of the Universal Church, the Pope is assisted by various agencies in carrying on the immense work implied in the government of a society which embraces over three hundred million members. The papal government is divided into three departments, the administrative, the executive and judicial. The Rota is part of the judicial section of the Church government. Its function is to hear and decide cases submitted to it. The Rota consists of ten judges appointed by the Pope. They are usually men of the highest legal talent who have given proof of their capacity by long experience at the Bar of the Court.

Associated with the Rota is, first of all, the Promoter of Justice, an advocate of the foremost rank, whose duty it is to uphold ecclesiastical law, to conduct prosecutions, and to act in a general way as an ecclesiastical attorney general. Next in importance is the official known as the Defender of the Bond, whose office it is to defend strenuously the validity of the bond in all cases before the Court.

Cases are tried not by a single judge but by a court of three. If the case be very important

or unusual, it will be heard by the entire Court of ten. After all the evidence in the case has been presented, the advocates for and against the annulment present their arguments. These arguments are always in writing, in order that the judges may weigh them leisurely and without any influence of sentiment or oratory.

When a decision is arrived at, it is the judgment of the majority, and ordinarily is final. It may be affirmed without fear of contradiction, that no court in the world proceeds more carefully, conscientiously or capably than the Roman Rota. The judges are under solemn oath to give their decision solely on evidence and law.

The Rota is preëminently a Court of Appeal. To understand its functions it is advisable to say a word about the other tribunals which are associated with it. In every diocese of the world there is an ecclesiastical court whose function is to hear and decide diocesan cases. These local courts have their Promoter of Justice and Defender of the Bond, whose duties are the same as those of the corresponding officials in the Rota.

The Diocesan Court is, in legal terms, a Court of first instance. If an appeal be made from it,

it is carried to the Court of second instance, that of the Archbishop of the Province. If a second appeal be made, it is brought before the Court of last instance, the Roman Rota. If, however, a litigant wishes to appeal directly to the Rota from the diocesan court, he is at liberty to do so. In very special cases where the litigants have good ground for believing that the Rota has not given a just decision, the litigant may appeal to the Supreme Tribunal of the Apostolic Signatura, which consists of six Cardinals, and is sometimes presided over by the Pope himself. This Court does not try cases, but simply decides whether from some defect alleged, the case should again be opened for adjudication by the Rota. The existence of this Super-tribunal is a wonderful safeguard against judicial carelessness, inefficiency or corruption.

It must be evident from the foregoing that the Catholic Church regards the marriage bond in the very same light as He who declared "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

A valid and consummated Christian marriage may not be dissolved by any power on earth. The purpose of the ecclesiastical matrimonial courts is to discern if man and woman have been validly joined together. If they have, it is

God who has joined them, and God alone who may disjoin them.

It is clear, therefore, that annulment is not divorce. It is clear also that in certain cases annulment must be decreed. Were the Church not to pronounce annulment when a case is presented which demands it, she would be as guilty as if she presumed to grant divorce from a valid bond. The Catholic Church always takes for granted the validity of the marriage until it is absolutely proven invalid. The burden of proof for annulment rests with the appellant. It is only when it has been established beyond the slightest shadow of doubt that the marriage contract was executed contrary to some essential requirements of validity, that a decree of nullity will be issued.

Whenever therefore you hear of a Catholic marrying another before death has dissolved the marriage bond, you will know that the reputed marriage was no marriage at all. You will also know that the decision of nullity was reached only after the closest scrutiny that can be exercised by conscientious men. Nothing whatever is taken for granted. The decree for nullity is contested at every step and in the most drastic degree.

The Defender of the Bond scrutinizes every

detail of evidence, and challenges every statement that is not confirmed by the best possible corroboration.

A distinguished English Judge was permitted recently to review the evidence for annulment presented before the Roman Rota. After careful perusal, he remaked that he did not think that any court in the world could be so exacting. He was asked if he thought that the evidence justified a decree of annulment. He replied that it more than justified it. The prelate then informed him that the Rota had judged otherwise, and had decided not to issue the decree of annulment.

Sometimes it is objected to the procedure of the Catholic Church that only the rich can profit by her matrimonial courts. To this objection let it be said that the Ecclesiastical Court is the only one in the world where the poor are not at a disadvantage. It is Church law that those who are unable to bear the expenses of their case have a right to the necessary procedure without cost. For those unable to pay, the Judge must appoint one of the advocates of the Court, and the advocate so appointed must faithfully conduct the case under penalty of suspension from the Roll.

In the year 1927, of the fifty-three cases de-

cided by the Roman Rota, twenty-five were free of expense to the parties concerned.

In law suits, the poor are under a dreadful handicap in the civil courts. Wealthy people have the command of the best legal talent and can bring witnesses from the four quarters of the world. The poor ordinarily must either have a cheap lawyer or let the case drop.

During a period of six years, 30% of all the cases before the Roman Rota were free of costs. Nor did the appellants have to trust to inferior advocates. The cases of the poor were conducted in every instance by just as capable advocates as were those of the wealthy. There are no courts in the world which show such consideration for the poor as do the ecclesiastical.

If a marriage be null and void, the Church is more desirous of declaring it so than the parties are to have it so declared. But she must first be certain that it is null and void. Some persons declare that annulments in the Catholic Church are a substitute for divorce. In answer to this, it is only necessary to say that there are more divorces in the United States in one day than there are annulments in the whole Catholic Church in a year. In the United States in the year 1928 there were 195,939 divorces. This means an average of 537 a day.

ANNULMENT

Some people imagine that annulment is something peculiar to the Catholic Church. On the contrary, it is a common procedure in civil courts. In England there is on an average sixty annulment decrees issued every year by the civil courts. In the United States, because divorce is so much easier than annulment, people have recourse to divorce rather than annulment. Dreadful as the evil of divorce is in the United States, it would be immeasurably worse were it not for the reverence for marriage inculcated by the Catholic Church.

Conservative men of every creed are beginning to realize that unless the Catholic stand on marriage is taken, it will only be a question of time when pagan morality will prevail. In point of fact, paganism already flourishes to a great extent, especially with regard to sex.

Meanwhile, the Church established by Christ repeats after Him: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." From the very beginning, the Catholic Church has been faithful to her Divine Founder's teaching on marriage. She has sacrified kingdoms and endured persecution, proscription and martyrdom for upholding Christ's message to mankind. For twenty centuries she has proclaimed His truths regardless of the threats and promises of the

world. And for the centuries to come, she will continue to preach Christ and His doctrine to mankind unto the very consummation of the world. In carrying out her mission to mankind, she is mindful of the Divine Commission given to her by her Founder: "As the Father hath sent Me, I also send you."

Faithful to the trust assigned her, the Catholic Church will be, to the end of time, the voice of God in the world.

CHAPTER IX

Separation

A COMMON objection to the permanence of the marriage bond is that it imposes at times unbearable hardship on either husband or wife. People who make this objection might just as well object to the stability of a civil contract because of the difficulties its carrying out may entail.

When a young man contracts to join the army or navy for a term of years, he is held to his agreement regardless of difficulties, hardships and disillusionment. If several men enter into business partnership, and one or more find the agreement detrimental, they are not at liberty to withdraw from it. It may be replied that by mutual agreement the contract may be dissolved. Very true, but always and only insofar as it is lawful to do so.

If the nature of the contract be such that it does not allow of dissolution, it must be lived up to, regardless of consequences. If, for instance, a man legally adopt a child, he must stand by his agreement, regardless of how the

child may develop. The child may turn out to be unruly or a cripple or insane, but the adoptive father must adhere to his contract.

The nature of marriage, proclaimed by Christ, and confirmed by nature itself, is that it is indissoluble. When we say that marriage is indissoluble, we mean that the bond of a validly consummated marriage may not be severed. Severance of the bond means freedom from it. A bond may be slackened and yet bind. The marriage bond which may never be severed, may for just cause be slackened. A slackening of the bond does not leave either party free to form a new tie, but simply permits ease from a galling ligament. Circumstances may in certain cases advise a slackening of the marriage bond, permitting man and wife to live apart but not with right to marry another. The bond is just as binding under separation as it was before.

Very often it happens that separation brings both parties to serious reflection, and realizing their mutual obligations, they come together again, much wiser and happier for the temporary parting. If separation were allowed, with right to marry another, the estrangement would be magnified and the bond disregarded in order to form a new tie. But with the realiza-

tion that the bond holds until death breaks it, both man and woman are brought to sober thinking and ordinarily to a satisfactory reunion.

If, however, conditions are such that man and wife cannot live together without sinful wrangling and quarrels, the Church permits them to separate and remain separate, but never with the right to marry another.

Many divorces come about from the fact that a slight disagreement leads to a wide breach, because either party under temporary resentment or passion, regards the other as an impossible life-companion. If it were accepted that the companionship must be for life, the slight estrangement would gradually disappear, and normalcy would be restored.

Furthermore, there are ever so many little inconveniences and disagreements which would be taken for granted if the bond held till death, but which become the source of what is termed incompatibility, if it be seen that the bond may be severed and a new tie formed.

It is a mistake to think that marriage problems have begun to exist only in the nineteenth or twentieth century. They have existed always, but as divorce was not in prospect, the problems were solved normally. The modern

disease of incompatibility, which as a canker eats into domestic welfare, owes its origin, and rank growth mainly to the fact that frequently it is the path to a new mate. Incompatibility abounds in every state of life, but it does not form the basis of disruption.

A clerk in a department store very often experiences greater incompatibility than does many a man or woman who makes it the cause of divorce. Let any group of employees get together, and you will find the burden of their conversation is ventilating their grievances against this or that person or condition.

If lawyers or doctors or those of any profession engage in intimate exchange of opinion, it will inevitably lead to the abuses, injustices and annoyances of their profession. Yet these things do not engender incompatibility with their profession.

Nor did the vicissitudes of married life cause incompatibility until the door of divorce opened a way to another marriage. It makes all the difference in the world to a man whether he has got to stand conditions or not. Once he realizes that he must abide by conditions, he makes the best of them. If he knows he is not bound by them, he makes the worst of them. Some of the happiest marriages have resulted eventually

from conditions which at certain stages seemed to be intolerable.

It is a well established fact that the first few years of wedded life are apt to be the hardest. It is in this period that each is being schooled in the character and ways of the other. It is not always easy for one to adapt oneself to the disposition and habits of another. Yet if marriage is to be satisfactory, this is indispensable.

During the first years of wedlock, this mutual adaptation takes place, and in the process there may be not a few misunderstandings. Sensible people realize this, and make allowance for the friction which occasionally occurs. But young people are not always sensible. They are apt to be sentimental instead. Consequently instead of adapting themselves to each other, each may want to continue as a single, independent unit, with the result that the sparks fly. In this mood, a little outside sympathy from a friend of the opposite sex may fan the sparks into a flame, if it is seen that the bond may be thereby destroyed, and a new and supposedly more congenial mate be obtained. But with a realization that the bond holds until death severs it, it is remarkable that incompatibility either never arises or if it does show its head, soon vanishes.

Our forefathers had exactly the same nature as ourselves. They had the same domestic jams as people of the present day, but they engineered themselves out of them by patience, tact and mutual consideration. This is not to say that no husband or wife found marriage a lifelong domestic infliction. But these same persons might have found a second, third or fourth mate just as unbearable.

Christ in instituting matrimony a Sacrament, and proclaiming it indissoluble, was acting for the welfare of society, the family and the individual. This is not to say that in certain cases indissolubility does not work hardship on the individual. Every law made for general welfare is bound to cause annoyance or detriment to some individuals.

The automobile speed law is for the protection of the public generally. But a man speeding to catch a train finds the law oppressive. The automobile traffic lights are an absolute necessity for safety, nevertheless to the man in a hurry they are a bane.

The fact that marriage has its annoyances and hardships should not surprise us. In one's own family, before one gets married, one finds at times all sorts of differences and misunderstandings. Such a one should not be surprised

at these occurrences when he establishes a home of his own. It was because Christ knew human nature that He made marriage a Sacrament, endowing it with special grace to enable husband and wife to live in mutual forbearance, and to rear their offspring properly. Grace presupposes coöperation. Man must do his part.

Water will quench thirst, but not unless man will drink it. The Sacramental grace of marriage is conferred on those who are united in holy matrimony, but it presupposes that man and wife will avail themselves of it. When God joins man and woman in wedlock, He also makes it possible for them to live in Christian harmony if they observe His precepts.

It is impossible for people to succeed in anything in life without due effort. Some persons fancy that once they are married, wedlock will take care of itself. Nothing takes care of itself except failure.

A merchant is careful to know and apply everything that pertains to business success. A lawyer or doctor must carefully proceed in his profession, noting whatever may advance or hinder his career, and doing or avoiding these things accordingly. Marriage is a career as well as that of a merchant or lawyer. If man and wife do not observe the various things which

make or mar wedlock, and do or avoid them accordingly, they must not be surprised that marriage turns out unfortunately. This is not to say that married people can always tread a path of roses.

There are certain hardships inherent in marriage, such as mutual forbearance, care of children, and the problem of family maintenance. These are part of the contract, and must be expected. There are other difficulties not inherent in marriage, but arising from a lack of mutual consideration. Husband and wife must realize that they are no longer separate units, but two in one flesh. If the husband live his own life, and make his own plans for his own gratification, without due consideration for his life's companion, he invites family disruption. It is the same with the wife. If in her activities she does not consult the feelings, wishes and character of her husband, she must not be surprised if after a while he goes his way, regardless of her and her welfare.

Not marriage, but the abuse of marriage is accountable for domestic infelicity. Not marriage, but the selfishness of man or wife causes broken homes. Selfishness is the great enemy of wedlock. The most helpful factor to a satisfactory marriage is for the man to live primarily

for his wife, and for the woman to live primarily for her husband. In this way each will live for the other, which eventually means living doubly for self, for nothing returns such high interest as consideration for others, especially if it be mutual, as it should be in wedlock.

If, however, the man go his way, or the woman go her way, and as a result there are bickerings, animosities and finally downright hatred, what is to be done? If there are children in the case, husband or wife should make every sacrifice rather than break up the home. Even if there be no children, separation should be the very last solution of the problem. Only after every conceivable endeavor for adjustment has failed, should recourse be had to separation.

Experience teaches that separation is an evil second only to divorce. However, at times conditions are such that separation is not only advisable but imperative. If husband or wife be degraded or tormented by the viciousness or malevolence of the other, and the situation seems to be irremediable, it is better for both if they separate. But this should be the very last remedy, and only after every other effort at solving the problem has failed.

Very frequently it happens that a separation

opens the eyes of both husband and wife, and that a reconciliation and reunion follow. Both man and woman learn from experience that it pays to practise patience in the home circle. Patience is a virtue as much as honesty or any other moral excellence. Virtue always implies self-mastery. The thief is a thief because he does not control his passion for possession or gain. The liar is a liar because he does not control his desire to avoid the consequences of his deeds, or to attain some end in view. Self-mastery is essential to success in any career. The merchant must control his desire for rest and recreation if the welfare of business require it. Time and again exhausted business men would like to close shop and indulge in some restful diversion, but if the good of the business demand it, he stays close to his wearisome duties.

There is no business so important as that of the family peace and welfare. Husband and wife cannot be really happy, no matter what outside success they have, if the home be a failure. For the most important of all businesses, the home, husband and wife should certainly be willing to practise the self-mastery which is necessary for the welfare of every business or career.

Self-mastery in the home is practised mainly by patience. Patience solves many difficulties. Conditions which seem intolerable often remedy themselves with a little time and patience. The meaning of the word patience is calm endurance. It comes from a Latin word which signifies to suffer or bear. Patience, therefore, is a virtue by which a person calmly endures whatever displeases or inconveniences him. Everybody would like to be virtuous if virtue cost nothing. But every virtue has a price and sometimes a high price. It costs a lot at times to be truthful. A man often pays dearly for being honest. So with the virtue of patience. Everybody admires a considerate person, but not everybody is willing to practise the virtue of patience which is the soul of consideration.

Family welfare is certainly worth any price required for it. Patience is the price most frequently demanded. In the long run, it costs less to be patient than it does to bear the ills which come from impatience.

This is not a treatise on patience, but it is a diagnosis of the disease of family disruption, and a prescription for the disease. Nine out of ten broken homes are caused by lack of mutual tolerance, and patience is the remedy for this distemper. Married people are sometimes in-

clined to believe that wedlock is the only career which requires patient endurance. Every career in life requires it, from that of the humblest clerk in a store to the head of the greatest emporium in a metropolitan city.

Life is a warfare, no matter how we regard it. The battles become less frequent and less serious by the practise of patience. But as warfare implies struggle, so does life. The best way to reduce the seriousness of life's warfare is to realize that it is warfare. What we expect and prepare for loses half its potency for harming us.

Those who have brought up a family properly, understand that it is not an easy task. What with providing for the family, and suitably rearing and educating the children, there is enough to try the fortitude and patience of the best parents. But warfare has its triumphs. It may be said without exaggeration that the triumphs rewarding the fortitude and patience of parents surpass the successes achieved in any other department of life. A peaceful home, where parents are respected and children reverent, presents the nearest approach to an earthly paradise that this world affords. The solicitude and endeavors of parents are indeed a source of no little suffering both of mind and body, but

they richly repay the outlay. Family welfare has its price as everything else has. The price ordinarily is mutual consideration, shown principally in tolerance of each other's disposition and doings, in a word, patience.

There is no royal road to heaven. Life's journey to eternity cannot be made in a Pullman. But life's journey, no matter how rough the way, may be made smoother and more enjoyable by following the precepts of Him who is the Way, the Truth and the Life.

The story is told of a young man who had completed his medical studies at the University of Padua, that he was greatly worried about passing the State examination, which was necessary before he could be licensed to practise his profession. In a conversation with a friend, he learned that there was a miraculous crucifix at Florence, which if one prayed before it, would indicate whether or not the petition would be granted. The young man hastened to the Church and knelt before the crucifix. He was not ordinarily any too pious, but now he put a lot of devotion into his prayer. Addressing the Crucifix, he petitioned as follows: "O Lord grant that I may pass the State examination. My father and mother made great sacrifices for my education, and now they are old and dependent

on me. Grant, O Lord, that for their sake I may succeed."

With eyes earnestly fixed on the Crucifix, he awaited a response. To his amazement and joy, the head of the Crucified bowed assent. The young man was beside himself with elation. Thinking it a propitious occasion, he ventured to make another petition: "O Lord grant that I may have a lucrative practise and attain distinction in my profession!" Again the head bowed. The young man could hardly contain himself for joy.

Believing that possibly this was an invitation to proceed further, he added another earnest prayer: "O Lord, grant that I may meet a good, virtuous and beautiful woman, whom I will marry, and who will be to me a faithful wife!" The head again bowed assent.

The young man thought for a moment what else he could ask for, now that the asking was good. After reflection, he prayed thus: "O Lord, grant that I may have a happy family, dutiful sons and daughters, and that I may live to see them properly situated in life!" This time also the Crucifix granted the favor.

The happy man now thought a long while what else he could petition for. As he could think of no other earthly blessing, he concluded

his session with the following request: "And, Lord, grant that after a happy old age, I may die peacefully and go to heaven!" This time there was no movement in the Crucifix. Instead, a voice issued from it saying: "My child, there is but one heaven, if you have yours here, be not surprised if you have it not hereafter!"

Too often we forget that we have not here a lasting city. Too often we forget that life is probation. Married life, like single life, and every other life, has its vicissitudes, misunderstandings, ordeals and misgivings. The very best way to lessen the ordeals of wedlock is to take them as a cross and bear them after the Master. In so doing, the cross will lose its weight because it will be a yoke of faith and love.

The main reason why there is so much marriage infelicity in the present era is because there is so little real religion. Not a few people leave out the future life altogether in their attitude towards the present life. To do that means a one-sided and false view of human nature.

In proportion as Faith dominates life, will its problems find solution and adjustment. Marriage was intended by the Creator for man's welfare here and hereafter. True marriage is

a blessing to those who enter upon it as God directs.

The caricature of wedlock so common today, and which is falsely called marriage, is good neither for those who embrace it, nor for the society of which they form a part, sad to say, a disintegrating part. The sooner the world gets back to the true Christian idea of marriage, the better it will be for mankind.

CHAPTER X

Birth-Control

SOME people have the idea that the Catholic Church is the sole opponent of birth-control. The greatest opponent of birth-control is nature. Birth-control is nature-perversion, and nature has a way of dealing with those who pervert her processes.

Nature and the Creator are opposed to birth-control. The Catholic Church, which is the voice of God in the world, simply proclaims what the Creator and nature have decreed regarding birth-control. In order that we may realize that nature is opposed to birth-control, let us review what some of the greatest medical authorities have to say on the subject.

Before proceeding in the matter, let it be distinctly understood that there is birth-control and birth-control. Birth may be controlled in various ways. Those who do not marry, limit or control birth. Married people who exercise self-mastery with regard to sex-relation control birth. In fine, all those control birth who vol-

untarily refrain from exercising their natural sex rights.

There are some who affirm that no one has a right to renounce natural rights. But these objectors evidently overlook the fact that persons in every walk of life are constantly renouncing natural rights. It is a natural right of man to marry. There are many bachelors, notwithstanding, and some of the most strident opponents of those who renounce marital rights themselves, renounce marriage altogether. Error is never consistent, and erroneous advocates are never logical.

When the subject of birth-control is referred to, it does not concern voluntary natural control, but artificial perversion of nature's functions. The birth-control which God, nature and the Catholic Church condemns is that which employs artificial means or devices to interfere with nature's functions. Nature may be interfered with in various ways.

When a surgeon performs an operation for appendicitis, he interferes with nature. But such interference is not perversion of nature's functions, but coöperation with nature. By removing obstacles to her functioning, a surgical operation has for its purpose to enable nature to discharge her normal functions. If, for in-

stance, a tumor were not removed, it would clog the system and result in death. The removal of the tumor aids nature to function.

Birth-control interferes with nature not by aiding but preventing nature from functioning in its appointed way. This is why it is termed perversion of nature. It hinders nature from performing the particular function which it would naturally perform in consequence of certain sex actions. Perhaps an example will help us to understand the unnatural character of artificial birth-control.

Suppose a man should eat just for the pleasures of the palate, and refuse to let the food pass into the stomach, by ejecting it from his mouth as soon as he had satisfied his palate. Such a man if he persisted in this way of eating, would defeat nature's purpose, and eventually die.

Birth-control is just that. It causes the death not necessarily of the individual, but of the group which practises it. For this reason it is called race-suicide. Whole nations have disappeared from the human race on account of birth-control. The great Roman Empire collapsed because of the inroads of this perversion of nature. Another example will illustrate the perversion of nature by birth-control.

Suppose a person should eat for the pleasure of eating, and when he was gorged, employ artificial means to disgorge. Such procedure would be regarded as swinish. Nor is this a supposititious case. The Ancient Romans had alongside the dining room a place called the *vomitorium,* to which the gorged aristocrats retired, and after ejecting the contents of the stomach by vomiting, produced artificially, returned to the dining room to re-gorge. This shocks us. Yet what certain birth-controllers indulge in is precisely of the same nature.

It may not be pleasing to birth-controllers to have their practise brought before them in this disgusting form. But birth-control is in reality the very same kind of perversion as that of the Roman gormandizers. Ordinarily, those who practise birth-control hate the process, and despise themselves for its practise. They have recourse to it because they want the enjoyments of sex without its duties. They are like those players who want the thrills of the game without its knocks.

Birth-controllers are not good sportsmen. They want the sport but do not want to pay the price it exacts. Birth-controllers would be the first to condemn the practise, if they were not influenced by selfish considerations.

BIRTH-CONTROL

Birth-control is the highest degree of selfishness. It puts self before all else. It disregards the welfare of society for personal ends. It refuses to carry on. Birth-controllers are shirkers. They want the favors of nature without its burdens. They are like those individuals who enjoy the benefits of the nation, but refuse to make sacrifices for its safety and welfare. Such people were condemned by our national government during the World War, and branded as shirkers. There were those who tried to avoid the draft, yet were willing to share the protection which the army afforded. There were others who tried to dodge supporting the government, yet wanted to enjoy the opportunities afforded citizens of living in security and prosperity.

No doubt birth-controllers would be the first to condemn these shirkers. Yet they in their own way are acting in the very same manner towards society. Society cannot carry on without members. Birth-controllers refuse to do their duty to society in this respect.

However, as selfishness is at the bottom of birth-control, it is useless to appeal to the public spirit of those who practise it. They are not interested in the welfare of the race, but in their own indulgence. The reply they make to

this charge is, that they are interested in a better race, fewer members, larger opportunities. They contend that they can better educate one or two children than five or six, and that consequently they are giving quality rather than quantity to the race.

But the finest men in the history of the race have been members of large families. Some of the worst additions to human society have been the pampered children of limited families. In every generation it is the hardy sons of struggling and large families that come to the fore and crowd out the weaklings of birth-controllers.

No, birth-controllers are not solicitous for a better race but for better self-gratification. Other birth-controllers affirm that their financial condition does not permit them to have more than a very limited offspring. They plead poverty as a reason for restricting their offspring. But it is not the poor mainly that engage in this perversion. It is mostly the rich and the upper middle classes. Suppose these people were to plead poverty for not paying taxes. The government would tell them to limit their luxuries and do their duty by the nation.

Birth-controllers who contend that they cannot bring up a large family, seem to have money for everything else. They have their names en-

rolled in social and athletic clubs, dress in the height of fashion, live in desirable residential sections, enjoy the theatre, travel and other forms of entertainment. Of course, there will not be money for children if everything else comes first.

But the country is filled with large families whose heads deprive themselves of various desirable things in order to do their duty by the children God has given them. And it is the children of these parents who have been taught the lesson of sacrifice who form the backbone of the nation.

Finally, there are those who advocate and practise birth-control because of reasons of health. They affirm that child-bearing is incompatible with physical well-being. This is to affirm that nature is incompatible with nature. It is to criticize and condemn the Creator. In point of fact, the healthy women of the nation are not the mothers of one or two children. The youngest and healthiest woman for her age I ever saw was one of 45 years, the mother of twelve children. This mother looked almost as young as her eldest daughter, and was every bit as healthy.

There are more women's diseases now than at any period of history, and it is safe to say that

one of the principal causes is either directly or indirectly birth-control.

Man cannot improve on nature. Nature attaches pleasure to certain sex relations for a purpose. If this purpose be frustrated, nature hits back hard.

Dr. S. J. Holmes, Professor of Zoölogy in the University of California, and Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, says of birth-control:

> "Intelligence has outwitted Nature in the matter of regulating the birth supply, but Nature gets her revenge by remorselessly extinguishing her adversary" (*The World Tomorrow,* September, 1925).

There are certain sections of the United States where the verification of this statement is manifest today.

Parents who under the plea of having only one or two children, for the betterment of the race, found that accident or disease had done its work on limited offspring, and that instead of offering better members to the human race, they had contributed nothing at all. But in point of fact, these parents were not concerned with race betterment. What they were interested in was their own personal welfare. Even this they lost,

for in their old age, they had none of their own flesh and blood to comfort them. Moreover, their hoarded substance had not natural heirs to receive it, and it had to pass to strangers.

Truly, as Professor Holmes affirmed "Nature gets her revenge by remorselessly extinguishing her adversary."

Birth-controllers are not friends but enemies of the human race. Listen to the declaration of M. Paul Bureau, Professor of the Faculty of Law, University of Paris:

> "Whether he likes it or not every adult who claims the right to passing and unfruitful sexual relationhips; who avers that the possession of that sexual power with which he is endowed is for his own pleasure and enjoyment, spreads through society the seeds of disintegration and disorder" (*L'Indescipline des Moeurs,* 1924).

This should put the quietus on those blatant advocates of birth-control who maintain that they are concerned mainly for the welfare of humanity.

Man is not a solitary being. By nature society is his proper state of existence. Any harm done to society hurts its members. It is a mistake for people to fancy that they can be delinquent to society without detriment to them-

selves. Sooner or later nature exacts a toll from those who pervert her provisions.

Harm done to the race or posterity does not concern birth-controllers. In spite of their protestations that they aim at bettering the race, they persevere in their perversion of it, because their purpose is not public weal but personal advantage. That birth-control is a positive menace to social well-being is made evident by the report on this subject which Sir John Robertson, M.D., C.M.G., made, in 1924, to the authorities of the City of Birmingham, England:

> "The importance of birth-control to public health largely centres around the fact that already in a certain number of cases, most mischievous results have come to light, due to the fact that methods of birth-control are becoming widely known among young people who, as a result, indulge in promiscuous intercourse. . . . It seems likely, therefore, that there will be a great deal more promiscuous intercourse than at the present time, and if this did happen, it would be a serious menace to the family of this country. . . .
>
> "It is very questionable whether the members of large families do not make better citizens than the members of families of one or two only; also a good many

> arguments could be brought forward to indicate that the laborer with a family of five or six children is on the whole better off and lives a happier life than the laborer without a family, or with a family of one or two only."

This is the pronouncement of one of the greatest authorities in the world on birth-control.

If experience teach any lesson, it is that trifling with nature's laws acts as a boomerang.

Married people who practise birth-control have no reason to look for fidelity in their mates. Once that people have recourse to contraceptives, they will not ordinarily limit their use to the marriage state. The fear of the natural result of sexual intercourse is a great barrier to promiscuity. If husband and wife use contraceptives in their marriage relations, there is more than a probability that they will use them in extramarital relations. Moreover, if contraceptives be permitted parents, their use will spread to their children, with the result that promiscuity and its train of evils will blight their lives.

It cannot be made too plain and emphatic that nature cannot be trifled with. A wrong use of natural faculties always re-acts disas-

trously. Things in nature which are beneficial when done as nature ordains, are detrimental when done contrary to nature's provisions. The wrong use of anything perverts it.

What is more sacred than love? The love of husband for wife has been compared by St. Paul to the love of Christ for the Church. But suppose a man love the wife of another! The very same sexual relationship which is sacred when it exists between man and wife is criminal and sinful between man and another's wife.

The marital relation is sanctioned by the Creator Himself, and blessed by the Founder of Christianity. But if it be extended to those not united by the marriage bond, it becomes degrading, a sin, a violation of God's Command. Nature condemns such promiscuity, since it tends to bring forth children who may be deprived of permanent care, certainty of paternity, and the protection of a mother who is duly cared for.

Birth-control encourages people to do with impunity what they believe they can do with immunity. But they leave out Nature, which has its own way of retaliating. Any perversion of the sex faculty brings its own penalty eventually.

Here it may occur to the reader to ask just

what is meant by perversion of nature. Perversion of nature is the exercise of a natural faculty in such a way as to hinder it from doing what nature intends it to do. The generative faculty has for its specific and essential purpose to procreate offspring. When this faculty is so used as to prevent it doing what nature intends it to do, Nature is thwarted in her designs, and its purposes frustrated. Such frustration perverts Nature's function, diverting a faculty to an end not naturally intended and by so doing constitutes perversion of nature. In a word, birth-control is a frustration of nature in what is vital to mankind.

If birth-control were lawful to anyone it would be lawful to everyone. In that case its universal practise would be lawful and the human race would be at the mercy of birth-controllers, except that nature has a way of revenging herself by destroying birth-controllers.

Birth-control being a perversion of nature, is naturally repugnant to normal human nature. Many of those who practise it are disgusted with themselves for doing so. It lowers woman from the lofty pedestal on which matrimony places her as wife and mother. It tends to make husband and wife lose reverence for each other and to make them less faithful to the marriage bond.

It reduces the wife to the status of a kept woman.

In corroboration of this, let me give the words of this country's foremost authority on women's ailments. Dr. Howard A. Kelly, of the Johns Hopkins Medical School and Hospital says:

> "Practically I find that the people who come to me having used various mechanical devices of preventing conception, have lost something in their married life which ought to have been more precious to them than life itself. All meddling with the sexual relation to secure facultative sterility degrades the wife to the level of a prostitute" (*Harper's Weekly*, October 16, 1915).

Strong words those, yet true. In corroboration, let me quote the following from a distinguished jurist. Judge Lewis is not a theorist but a practical man who speaks from experience.

> "Childless Homes Lead to Divorce.
>
> "That is the considered opinion of Supreme Court Justice Lewis of Brooklyn, who, in a survey of sixty-four undefended divorce cases tried by him in one day, discovered that there was but one child for every two couples, and that the duration of the marriages averaged less than three years.

"This eminent jurist believes that too many women are not becoming mothers, and apparently have listened eagerly to the advocates of birth-control. As he is quoted in the press, Justice Lewis says:

" 'I have taken this matter up with my associates on the bench, and between us we have tried thousands of undefended marital cases.

" 'It is my conclusion that childless homes are responsible for the almost complete absence of real home life.

" 'In nine cases out of ten, the suing woman eagerly says she desires no alimony, which leads to the inescapable conclusion that she is so anxious to get rid of the man she promised to love, honor and obey, that she waives all alimony, and is willing to step out into the workaday world and earn her own livelihood.

" 'Not long ago a home meant something. It was the location of our birth. It was the place where we entertained our friends and where we held all our family functions.

" 'To-day we are born in hospitals, we entertain in our clubs, we eat in restaurants, we entertain our visiting friends in cabarets, we are married in the churches or hotels, and we are buried from funeral parlors.

" 'I cannot help but reach the conclusion that if our women had children there would be more happiness and fewer divorces.

" 'Presence of children attracts the husband to his home, and keeps the mothers from the gossiping neighbors and bridge parties.

" 'Absence of children promotes discord. Their presence makes for harmony.

" 'I know of scores of cases where the husband remains home merely for the sake of his love for the children. If such men did not have children, they would leave their wives and either get or give a divorce' " (*Literary Digest*, July 26, 1930).

When all is said, however, nothing will deter people from the practise of birth-control if they have lost their respect for God and His holy law. Birth-controllers do not care a particle for the future of the race, nor for the detriment to society, nor for the debasing effect on their own offspring. Birth-controllers care only for their own selfish and immediate gratification. Their motto is "after us the flood." But sometimes the flood unexpectedly engulfs themselves. Not infrequently a wife who becomes pregnant in spite of contraceptives, as often happens, is accused of infidelity by her husband, and a tragedy results. Often too, the husband relying on contraceptives, finds that he is the father of a child whose mother is not a wife. Another tragedy.

It may be asked, however, is not birth-control sometimes lawful? Suppose a wife's life is in danger if she bear another child, what is she to do? Let it be asked: Suppose a wife's life is in danger if she eat certain foods, what is she to do? She must abstain from those foods. So with regard to a mother who realizes she cannot safely bear another child, she must refrain from what causes child-birth. But, it may be asked, does this not impose an unwarranted sacrifice on the husband? A man has to make sacrifices for business, for society, for health, and for many other things. Surely he should be prepared to make sacrifices for his wife's welfare. Let it be said, however, that frequently the alarm is false which predicts danger in such cases.

Experience shows that almost universally the wives who do their duty in this matter, and trust to God, seldom meet with the dire consequences which they were led to fear. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that in every career of life, there are dangers to be met with and sacrifices to be made. The soldier may not decline to obey the orders of his commander because there is danger of life or limb. God's commands are more obligatory than those of man.

Marriage is not immune from the sacrifices

and dangers which are inherent in every career of life. The physician, the nurse, the fireman, the policeman and others such are obliged to put duty before every other consideration. Husband and wife have a duty to God. Of course if man and wife are not Christians, or if they do not believe in a power above to whom they must give an account of their stewardship, they will not be influenced by any arguments of supernatural morality.

But whether or not they believe in God and a future accountability, they are human beings and understand that nature cannot be perverted with impunity. The world is strewn with human wrecks as the result of ignoring the laws of nature. Nature has her own way eventually of collecting toll from those who frustrate her functions.

Apparently man may cheat nature, but only apparently. Witness the hundreds of thousands of ruined lives every year from vicious practises of one kind or another. There are more fatalities from violating nature's laws than from war. The ravages of vice are less spectacular and more hidden than the casualties of war, but they are none the less just as dreadful.

Birth-control is a vice, a frustration of nature. Those who have no religion or who do not live

up to the precepts of their religion, should at least give heed to the voice of nature. Catholics hearken to the voice of the Church established by Christ, and obey her mandates as they would those of God Himself, as indeed they are.

For Catholics it is enough to know that the Church of Christ forbids birth-control under penalty of mortal sin. No Catholic who persists in the practise of birth-control may receive the sacraments. A Catholic must either promise to desist from this sin or be refused sacramental absolution.

Birth-control is a spawn of irreligion or false religion. It is the result of the denial or ignoring of the supernatural. It conforms to the motto of those who proclaim with regard to life: "The flower that once has blown forever dies."

It is useless to argue on conscientious grounds with those who are a law to themselves. But nature will not be outwitted. Man may temporarily ignore both God and nature, but both have their own time and manner of vindicating their authority.

The Creator has endowed man with free-will, and will not interfere with it. Man can, if he wish, employ his free-will to defy its Giver. But in the end man must answer for the use he has made of this priceless gift. The greatest thing

in life is to do God's will. Christ emphasized this in the only prayer He taught us to address to His Eternal Father: "Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done on earth as it is in heaven." The Will of God is the sure way to the possession of the Kingdom of God.

After all, it is worth any sacrifice to attain the eternal home that God has prepared for those who love Him. Everybody would love God if it required no effort or sacrifice. Christ has given us the test of our love for Him: "If you love Me keep My Commandments." He who uttered these words also declared of the Church He established: "He that heareth you, heareth Me."

This is enough for Catholics. This is why no Catholic who is a Catholic in reality will practise birth-control.

239.47 2 3122
Sc 85
SCOTT, MARTIN J.
AUTHOR
Marriage
TITLE

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME
	Ohowalter
	Williams
	Whitten

3122